

17, 1924, in favor of adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1518. By Mr. PATTERSON: Memorial of the New Jersey State Bar Association, indorsing an increase of salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1519. Also, memorial of Pride of Bridgeport Council, No. 168, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Bridgeport, N. J., supporting the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1520. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Fairbank, Iowa, favoring strict enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1521. By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Petition of the Congregational and Baptist Churches of New Ipswich, N. H., favoring a child labor amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1522. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of board of governors of the International Farm Congress of America, urging the Congress to acquire swamp and waste lands in order to preserve wild life; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1523. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of James B. Lay Camp, No. 44, Sons of Veterans, Massachusetts Division, of Westfield, Mass., by Ashley E. Bryant, chairman, H. A. Fuller, and Harry L. Houghton, in support of bill to provide increased pensions to veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 5, 1924.

(Legislative day of Monday, March 3, 1924.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ferris	King	Sheppard
Ashurst	Fess	Ladd	Shields
Bayard	Fletcher	La Follette	Shortridge
Borah	Frazier	Lodge	Simmons
Brandegee	George	McKellar	Smith
Brookhart	Gerry	McLean	Smoot
Bruce	Glass	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Gooding	Mayfield	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Stanley
Capper	Harrell	Norris	Stephens
Caraway	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Couzens	Harrison	Overman	Wadsworth
Cummins	Heflin	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Howell	Philpotts	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Warren
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Watson
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Weller
Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Edwards	Keyes	Robinson	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2250.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 2014) to authorize the Park-Wood Lumber Co. to construct two bridges across the United States Canal which connects Apalachicola River and Saint Andrews Bay, Fla.; and

A bill (H. R. 4121) to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Hawaii.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the Independent Brotherhood of Steam and Electrical Engineers and Assistants, of Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the Federal incorporation of all international, national, State federations, central bodies, and unions of labor; applying the laws governing corporations with equal force to all labor organizations now in existence or that may be organized in the future, and declaring null and void all laws now in effect interfering therewith, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of the Retail Merchants' Board, of Toledo, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation

granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution of the Hartwell Business Men's Club of Hartwell, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the fostering of the American merchant marine and protesting against the ratification of any treaties not leaving the United States free to favor its merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEYES presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of West Lebanon, N. H., praying an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Charles G. Fenton, of Rochester, and sundry other citizens in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of legislation repealing or reducing the so-called nuisance and war taxes, especially the tax on industrial alcohol, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution of the Embroidery Club of Stafford Kans., favoring the passage of legislation regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry Civil War veterans and widows, of Pomona, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Bursum bill granting pensions of \$72 per month to Civil War veterans and \$50 per month to their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a resolution of the directors of the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of legislation adjusting salaries of postal employees and making the Post Office Department self-sustaining by adjusting postal rates so as to correspond thereto, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial, numerous signed, of members of shop associations of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway System, at Wellington, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation making any substantial change in the transportation act of 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented the petition of William McKinley Camp, No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, of Norwalk, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of the Citizens' Club of New Britain; members of the Italian Congregational Church of Bridgeport; and Horeb Lodge, No. 25, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnson selective immigration bill, as being discriminatory, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions of the League of Women Voters of Sound Beach, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Moodus, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clinton, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Milldale, all in the State of Connecticut, praying an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution of the Fairfield County League of Women Voters, of Stamford, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation reducing taxes before March 15, 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram and a letter in the nature of petitions from the Seichpey Post, American Legion, of Bristol, and Torrington Post, No. 38, American Legion Auxiliary, of Torrington, both in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation granting adjusted compensation to veterans of the World War, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens held at the Old State House, at Hartford, Conn., favoring the enactment of legislation granting adjusted compensation to veterans of the World War, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Women's National Association (Inc.), of Middletown, Conn., praying for the passage of Senate bill 1766, placing certain positions in the Postal Service in the competitive classified service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted at the Annual Convention of the Connecticut Association of Postmasters, held at New Haven, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation adjusting salaries of postal employees and the placing of postmasters under the civil service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Connecticut Branch, National League of District Postmasters of the United States, of Sound View, Conn., praying for the passage of Senate bill 1832, granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Postal Employees' Salary Committee, National Association of Letter Carriers; of the Supervisory Post Office Employees' Association; of New Haven Lodge, No. 25, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; of Edgewood Lodge, No. 11, Knights of Pythias; of the Lillian M. Hollister Review, No. 7, W. B. A. Maccabees; and of Star of Hope Lodge, No. 12, Shepherds of Bethlehem, all of New Haven; of the Mattatuck Council, No. 713, Royal Arcanum, and of the Joint Committee of Postal Employees, of Waterbury; of Branch No. 59, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Bridgeport; of Silver City Branch, No. 227, National Association of Letter Carriers, of Meriden; and of Ansonia Aerie, No. 1996, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Ansonia, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. DILL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ralston, Wash., praying for the granting of relief to the destitute people of Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SALARIES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CAPPER. I present a memorial of the city commissioners of Kansas City as to the salaries of postal employees, which I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., February 21, 1924.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by the city commissioners of Kansas City, Kans. This for your information:

Resolution 8191.

"Be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Kansas City, Kans., That the salaries paid the postal employees of the United States fixed by an act of Congress and approved June 5, 1920, are not sufficient to properly enable these employees to live in accordance with their proper needs. We therefore urge your committee to recommend the scale of wages presented by the post office clerks, letter carriers, and the Railway Mail clerks (H. R. 4123, S. 1898); be it further

"Resolved, That we recommend that a differential for night work be granted these employees, as it is quite evident that the night work is more arduous and exhausting than day work; be it further

"Resolved, That their retirement legislation be recommended as presented. (H. R. 705 and S. 1220.)"

Adopted by the board of commissioners, February 5, 1924.

HOWARD PAYNE, City Clerk.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the National Merchant Marine Association in this city its governing council adopted a rather interesting set of resolutions touching the merchant marine and its relation to the pending commercial treaty with Germany. I ask unanimous consent that those resolutions may be referred to the Committee on Commerce and inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted at annual meeting of the governing council of the National Merchant Marine Association, in Washington, D. C., March 4, 1924.

Resolved by the governing council of the National Merchant Marine Association, That we are unalterably opposed to any provisions of the contemplated commercial treaty with Germany, or of any future treaty with any other country, that would prevent the United States from granting aid and encouragement to its merchant marine in foreign trade through a system of preferential customs duties and tonnage dues, or through a system of preferential railroad rates, whenever such methods of assistance may seem desirable or necessary. We do not, however, object to the inclusion, in the pending or any other treaty, of the most-favored-nation principle.

Resolved, That we heartily uphold and urge the prompt enactment of the bill before Congress for the use of the construction loan fund provided in the merchant marine act, 1920, for the conversion of

steamships into motor ships as the most immediate and direct means of promoting the efficiency and economy of American shipping in overseas commerce.

Resolved, That we also reaffirm the resolutions adopted by the governing council of the National Merchant Marine Association September 25, 1923, as follows:

"That the National Merchant Marine Association favors private operation of American shipping and is opposed to any form of Government operation.

"That there should be prompt enforcement of section 21 of the merchant marine act of 1920, applying the coastwise laws to insular possessions, including the Philippines; and also of section 34 of the same act, providing for notification of an intent to modify the commercial treaties that now stand in the way of a return to preferential duties and tonnage taxes.

"That enactment by Congress is favored of legislation applying the principle of preferential duties and tonnage taxes for the encouragement of American shipping as against vessels of other nations engaged in the indirect trade.

"That certificates should be issued to American exporters of goods of American production in American vessels, and to American importers of goods on the free list in American vessels; these certificates, which could be made negotiable and transferable, representing a percentage of the value of the goods, and ultimately to be used in the payment of customs duties.

"That governmental forces and supplies should be carried in privately owned American ships, and that ocean travel by Government officials and employees should be restricted to American ships, when these are available.

"That a national policy should be adopted, reserving the transportation of, as nearly as practicable, one-half of the total number of immigrants admitted to the United States in any fiscal year to vessels registered or enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States.

"That an immediate and thorough revision is recommended of the navigation laws and rules of the United States, through the cooperation of the Department of Commerce, the Shipping Board, and the private ship owners and operators of the country, with prompt action by Congress.

"That there should be a closer coordination of rail and water transportation for facilitating the export commerce of the interior of the country, and that the association pledges its best efforts to bring about a practical working out of this policy.

"That the officers and men of the American merchant marine should be enrolled in the Naval Reserve of the United States under suitable regulations as to pay, qualifications, and duties.

"That the repeal is recommended of all laws that admit foreign-built ships, including yachts, to American registry."

Resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the governing council of the National Merchant Marine Association, held at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., March 4, 1924.

Whereas the Hon. JOSEPH E. RANDELL, Senator from Louisiana, has served as president of the National Merchant Marine Association since its inception; and

Whereas Senator RANDELL has unsparingly devoted his time and energy to the purpose of this organization, namely, the development of a merchant marine under the American flag adequate to the needs of the Nation in time of peace as well as in time of war; and

Whereas Senator RANDELL has constantly, with admirable persistence, in public addresses and on the floor of the Senate, brought to the attention of the public a realization of the value and necessity of an adequate merchant marine; and

Whereas Senator RANDELL has recently in his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee opposed a treaty which in the opinion of the governing council of the National Merchant Marine Association would have so tied the hands of this Government that the upbuilding of the merchant marine would have been seriously impaired, if not destroyed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the governing council of the National Merchant Marine Association tender to its president, the Hon. JOSEPH E. RANDELL, their hearty appreciation and sincere thanks for his services in thus promoting the development of a merchant marine, as before said, under the American flag adequate to the needs of the Nation in time of peace as well as in time of war.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORT COMMISSION.

Mr. NORRIS. Pursuant to permission that was given me by the Senate the other day, I submit the views of the minority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry upon the bill (S. 2012) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be printed as part 2 of Report No. 193.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 148) for the relief of William Mortesen, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 207) thereon.

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 168) authorizing the appointment of a special committee to investigate the Bureau of Internal Revenue, reported it with an amendment.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED.

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on yesterday they presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2583) granting the franking privilege to Edith Bolling Wilson.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2734) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights, and for other purposes," by adding thereto an additional clause; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2735) granting a pension to Harriett S. Dyer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2736) authorizing use of Government buildings at Fort Crockett, Tex., for occupancy during State convention of Texas Shriners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2737) authorizing the President to appoint Charles McKee Krausse a captain in the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2738) for the relief of Carrol A. Dickson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRELD:

A bill (S. 2739) granting a pension to Osema E. Dexter; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2740) for the relief of A. T. Whitworth; and

A bill (S. 2741) for the relief of the heirs of Israel Folsom and of Peter Folsom, both deceased, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2742) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2743) to amend section 975 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the recovery of costs by defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2744) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to ascertain the cost to the Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, and the amounts expended by it from December 1, 1906, to November 30, 1907, in closing and controlling the break in the Colorado River, and to render judgment therefor as herein provided; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 2745) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the States in which located Government owned or controlled approach roads to national cemeteries and national military parks, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2746) regulating the recovery of allotments and allowances heretofore paid to designated beneficiaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2747) to provide for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of fertilizers, bases of war materials, explosives, and other products; for the construction and operation of Government-owned dams; hydroelectric and steam electric power and nitrate plants; for water-power conservation; for stream control and navigation; and to authorize the Secretary of War to enter into a contract with a corporation to be known as The United States Muscle Shoals Power and Nitrates Corporation, or other suitable title, organized for the purpose of taking over, operating, and building the Muscle Shoals project at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2748) for the relief of David Thygersen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 2749) granting a pension to Jose Esperidion Pineda; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2750) granting a pension to Mary E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2751) to authorize the addition to national forests of lands revested in United States by the act of June 9, 1916, or reconveyed to the United States under act of February 26, 1919; and

A bill (S. 2752) to authorize the addition to national forests of lands revested in United States by the act of June 9, 1916, or reconveyed to the United States under act of February 26, 1919; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 2753) for the construction of a public building at Culpeper, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 2754) for the establishment of migratory-bird refuges to furnish in perpetuity homes for migratory birds, the establishment of public shooting grounds to preserve the American system of free shooting, the provision of funds for establishing such areas, and the furnishing of adequate protection for migratory birds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2755) to amend the classification act of 1923; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

A bill (S. 2756) for the relief of Walter L. Watkins, alias Harry Austin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2757) granting an increase of pension to Murray Pierce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2758) for the relief of Jacob D. Nelson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 2759) granting privilege of the floor and right to participate in debate to heads of executive departments and other officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LADD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) providing an extension of time for payment by entrymen of lands on the Fort Assiniboine abandoned military reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk during the Sixty-eighth Congress at the rate of \$2,000 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

DISMISSALS IN THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

On motion of Mr. CARAWAY, the resolution (S. Res. 23) requesting the President to inform the Senate what facts warranted the dismissal from the public service of certain officials of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, submitted by Mr. CARAWAY December 10, 1923, was indefinitely postponed.

AGRICULTURAL DIVERSIFICATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to promote a permanent system of self-supporting agriculture in regions adversely affected by the stimulation of wheat production during the war, and aggravated by many years of small yields and high production costs of wheat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, the bill now before us provides—

That it is hereby declared in the public interest that conditions existing in those portions of the United States known particularly as the wheat areas resulting from the stimulation of wheat growing during the recent war and aggravated during subsequent years by low yields and high costs of production should be changed through the encouragement of a system of agriculture not dependent for its success upon wheat alone, but cultivation would include the raising of livestock, such as dairy and beef cattle, hogs, sheep, poultry, and the products thereof.

This bill proposes for the Secretary of Agriculture to lend money direct to farmers in the wheat-growing States on chattel mortgages, cattle, hogs, sheep, and so forth.

If such legislation is to pass, why not let it apply to all agriculture in the United States generally. This act is patern-

alism run mad. The object to be attained is exceedingly desirable, but the method is contrary to all the doctrines of good government. We have a reputation to sustain, a duty to perform, an oath to uphold. I am not surprised at the introduction of the bill after considering our action of last week in passing the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones]. That was a joint resolution appropriating a million dollars for similar purposes in New Mexico. I am glad that I opposed that measure. But it shows the effect of precedents. Now, where are we to stop? We know that the next bill along this line will attempt to appropriate \$150,000,000, instead of \$50,000,000, as provided in the pending bill. It seems to me that we have lost all sense of proportion. It occurs to me that this is about the greatest charitable institution in the world. I must admit that I admire the kind-heartedness of my colleagues, but I question the soundness of their conclusions.

This particular bill undertakes to affect only a very small section of the United States, a few States in the northwestern section, and when we pass this bill, if we do, though I hope we will not, it will put up the price of wheat in that section of the country so that the people in the cities and the farmers of the South will have to pay an increased price for the bread they eat. I regret to raise my voice against any measure which undertakes to benefit any farmer in the United States. I feel kindly toward everyone who produces and thereby adds to the wealth of the world, but unless we are going to reverse all of our policies of the past and unless we are going to put the United States in the banking business, we ought not even to consider this kind of legislation.

Our friends come here and say that the people of those States principally grew wheat and increased their wheat production during the war for patriotic purposes. I do not question that; but they also increased the production of wheat because the price was attractive.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the people of this country were not only urged to produce wheat with which "to win the war" but they were urged to increase the production of livestock. The Government urged the people to produce all kinds of food, not only wheat, but everything else which could be consumed.

There is no difference between the condition which exists in the part of the United States which is now proposed to be relieved by the pending legislation from the other sections of the country. In my section, indeed in the whole South, during the World War we increased the production of cotton not only from patriotic purposes but because the price was attractive. We decreased the production of hogs, cows, sheep, and poultry in the southeastern section of the country; in fact, there is a greater scarcity of those products in that section of the United States to-day than there is in any other section of the country. It is not necessary to go to North Dakota in order to find farms on which there is no livestock. The same condition may be found in going over the South and other sections. I do not like to expose the improvidence of my State, but a year ago, I believe it was, we consumed 83,000,000 pounds of butter while we produced only 13,000,000 pounds; we consumed 21,000,000 fowls but we produced only 7,000,000; we consumed 24,000,000 dozen eggs while we produced only 11,000,000 dozen. I presume that about the same relation between production and consumption obtains all over the South as obtains in South Carolina.

The condition which now confronts us is not dissimilar from that which existed after the Civil War. At that time the people in my section of the country had been deprived of all of their property except land, including their horses, mules, and other livestock. They had nothing with which to work their farms; they owned the land but that was about all they had; yet those people, possessing the sterling qualities of manhood, went to work and soon restored themselves.

If Senators will excuse me for a personal reference, I desire to say that I was raised on a farm. Of course, I can not remember very much as to the condition which existed immediately after the Civil War, I being then so young, but during the latter part of the seventies and early eighties the farmers in my section of the country were prospering notwithstanding they were getting an exceedingly low price for their chief product, which was cotton. When one visited a farm he would be entertained most royally. The farmers who had the correct idea of farming raised on the farm what was necessary to support the farm; they had but little to buy.

I was almost a grown man before I ever heard of a mortgage on a farm. It would then have been considered a disgrace in my section of the country for the farmers to have mortgaged their property.

In those days there was not a single bank in my county, which was one of the most prosperous counties in South Carolina. I remember when the first bank was organized in 1886 in that county, and I helped to organize the second bank there in 1887.

So it is not altogether a question of providing money; the great fault is in ourselves, in being the slaves to the system of producing too much of one crop. The Government is not to blame for this. We ourselves should regulate these things. If we produce more of a particular kind of crop than can be profitably marketed, we ought to diversify and grow something else, particularly something which can be consumed on the farm, and thereby stop paying middlemen's charges, high freight rates, and a profit to others. Farmers should make their farms self-sustaining, and then they will be independent of all the interests which now live off the farmer.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the World War was fought to protect and save the very people who are now here asking us to make this enormous loan. They received the benefit of the war, and, therefore, they should not come here now and ask to be parceled out and favored in this unsound, this uneconomic, this unconstitutional manner.

I wish there were some way to test the constitutionality of the bills which we undertake to pass and which we do pass here with such ease. I wish it were possible for Congress to be hauled into court and enjoined from donating the money of the people; and I believe it will come to that by an amendment to the Constitution or in some other way, if we break our oaths and go on from time to time passing such unsound measures. There is no ground upon which to justify them. I venture to say that not a single self-sustaining legislature in the United States would advocate this kind of a bill. They would know it was unsound; that it was dangerous; but because Washington is remote from the sections which it is proposed particularly to benefit, their constituents come here and make pleas for legislation under the belief that we are ready to dump the Treasury into their laps and enter upon this kind of unsound legislation through motives of sympathy. We will never have a country worth calling a country until our people learn that they should be self-sustaining and that they should work out their own financial salvation, instead of coming to Congress and asking that some other taxpayer shall make them a living. The people do not ask it; politicians ask it.

We thought the farm-loan bank system was a good thing. The idea back of it, indeed, is commendable. We will all admit, of course, that it is beneficial for people to own their homes, and that is a condition which I should like to see—a property-owning population, every man owning his own home. We would thereby make stronger citizens, better citizens, more prosperous citizens, independent citizens, citizens who would defend their country in time of war, and would think more of themselves and more of their surroundings and more of their posterity. I happen to know, however, that even under the farm-loan system—certainly it is true of certain cases which I have investigated—very little of the money made available has been used to buy additional homes. I am not opposing the system in saying that; but I talked to a lawyer not long ago who said that he had passed on some 50 or 60 titles, and only one man had bought any additional land, and he bought only 17 acres. So it is a false preachment, it is a false doctrine, it is an erroneous notion, that the citizen can go to his Government and get rich. We should legislate according to the Constitution; we should legislate honestly and fairly and equitably as between all classes of our people, with no special privilege to any of them. I do not believe that even the farmers want any special privileges. If we would pass correct laws, including a just tariff law, honest banking laws, correct freight laws, and other legislation along those lines, and get back on a balanced legislative system, we would better promote the interests and the welfare of all the people of the United States. We need a balanced agriculture.

People do not like to be put under obligations to their Government any more than they do to their friends and their neighbors. We want an independent population, but we are going a long way now to raise up a dependent citizenry, unmolested by the National Government, as they should do.

The idea of the Government loaning money directly to the individual on his wheat crop or livestock is preposterous. The Agricultural Department is not prepared to administer such a law; and to come here and talk about the professors of agricultural colleges or demonstration agents or some State official offering to tender their services is nonsense. If a business does not justify paying people for carrying it on, that business ought not to be embarked upon. Not only that, but the first few offers

the Secretary of Agriculture would receive from private individuals in the State to handle the money would require him to proceed cautiously, lest some one might have a job to put upon the Government and might misuse the funds in some way or another.

The Government has no business to engage in banking. It is dangerous, unscientific, and unsatisfactory, and too expensive. The friends of this bill in their arguments say the banks out in the northwestern section of the country are broke. Why did they break? Simply by lending too much money to the very same kind of people, I presume, who now want the Government to come in and sink a large sum of the taxpayers' money, the money of people who have worked hard and who are already overburdened to the breaking point with unnecessary taxation.

Perhaps, Mr. President, they are trying to farm where the soil and the climate and the surroundings are not suitable to agriculture. The remedy would be, therefore, to engage in something that they can make profitable, and if they can not do that I would invite all of the native farmers out there—I emphasize the word "native"—to come down South where the Creator blessed us with a climate and a soil and a rainfall unsurpassed, and where they could not only make a living but they could get rich and be happy as soon as the Congress of the United States will repeal some of the nefarious, unjust, one-sided laws which discriminate against that section of the country.

Last year we established the intermediate credit banks. We thought at that time that that was about all the legislation that would be required to carry on the different kinds of business in the United States. Under that system the Government is relieved from the details of lending money, but if the paper is sound the money will be forthcoming from the local banks. It seems to me that that is a splendid piece of constructive legislation, and it ought to be availed of, and it should furnish relief to the people who need help in that direction. A year or two since we also restored the War Finance Corporation, which has done great work in aiding agriculture.

This bill can not help the man who is down and out and who has no security to put up. I do not know what they have done to the land out there if they can not get some money. Why do they not call their legislatures together? Why do they not call their bankers' State conventions together, or why do they not call a public meeting and see if they can not devise some scheme whereby whatever is necessary to the diversification of crops can be done? They should not come here and complain because they did not get as much for their wheat as they expected to get. They got more than they ever got before. I asked Senator NORRIS yesterday what was the average price of wheat in 1914. He said he would have to look it up. My recollection is that it was about \$1 per bushel. The Government fixed the price at \$2.20, which was looked on as a pretty good price. Perhaps they wanted more; but because the Government had to take over some wheat and because the Government may have made a little profit on it they say now that they want us to go back there and practically donate that money back to them.

This Government has already loaned a good deal of money to that section, which it has not collected. I ask unanimous consent that the statement which went into the Record yesterday, showing the amount due the Government and the losses, be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Statement showing the amount of seed loans by States in 1921 and 1922, with the total collections and the percentage collected to November 24, 1923.

[Original amount loaned by States, amount of principal collected to November 24, 1923, and percentage of total collected to November 24, 1923.]

	1921 loan.			1922 loan.		
	Loans.	Collections.	Per cent.	Loans.	Collections.	Per cent.
Idaho.....	\$85,331.00	\$77,376.97	81.17	\$24,684.50	\$20,698.39	83.85
Montana.....	1,044,578.00	578,184.51	55.35	755,492.29	468,503.71	62.01
North Dakota.....	808,073.20	551,163.26	68.20	660,588.05	500,520.24	75.76
South Dakota.....				37,611.85	32,527.29	86.48
Washington.....	9,419.00	5,248.74	55.72	1,730.00	555.85	32.13
Total.....	1,957,407.20	1,211,973.48	61.92	1,480,106.60	1,022,805.48	69.10

Of the \$1,211,973 of 1921 loans collected, \$660,403 were paid in by June 15, 1922; \$500,576 between June 16, 1922, and June 30, 1923; and \$50,994 between June 1, 1923, and November 24, 1923.

In other words, more than \$550,000 have been paid on the 1921 loans since June 16, 1922, most of this, of course, having been collected out of crops subsequent to the one on which the loan was made. Of the payments on the 1922 loan, \$56,863 have been collected since July 1, 1923, most of which being paid out of proceeds of the 1923 crops.

The Treasury Department has appropriated \$45,000 to collect the amounts past due.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, the way to diversify is by local help, local assistance. Just get ready and go ahead and diversify.

If Senators will excuse me for another personal reference, I will tell them of a little incident that occurred in my life, and it might be well for them to consider that process.

Along about 1914 the people in my county had almost stopped raising hogs. I called a demonstration agent into my office and told him to buy me a carload of stock hogs. He was astonished. He wanted to know what I wanted with them. I told him I wanted him to sell them to the people and help them raise hogs; that I had gotten tired of paying about 40 cents a pound for western bacon, and that we were going to raise some hogs in Laurens County, S. C. He bought a carload of 124 hogs and shipped them to my town. I told him to sell them for cash if he could get it, if they wanted to pay cash; and, if not, to sell them on credit. I told him to credit any white man or white boy; I did not care whether the boy was over 6 years old or not; to take his note for a hog and let him go into the hog-raising business.

The first day he sold 85. He came to the office and said: "What are we going to do? We have about 50 left. They are going a little slowly." I said: "Sell them." He said: "To whom?" I said: "If the white people do not want them, sell them to the colored population." He disposed of every one of those hogs, without any profit except the regular bank rate. Of course, nobody wanted to handle those little notes, they were for such small amounts that the interest was not appreciable; but I wanted to try the experiment.

It was not long until we began to increase the hog population of that county, and it multiplied most rapidly, and he it said to the credit of my people, we did not lose one cent upon that purchase. We did carry a few notes over until the next year, but every dollar was paid, with only the regular rate of banking interest, what I charged myself. That is the way to build up a country, if you will allow me to say so.

A few years after that the price of cotton got so high that our people did not want to raise hogs. They came to me and said: "Here, you made us overdo it." I said: "What do you mean?" They said: "We have so many hogs that we do not know what to do with them. We have all the meat necessary to live on this year, and we have great, big, fat hogs in the pasture, and the butchers can not take them. There is not enough local demand for them." "Oh, that is fine, thank you; I will take them." So I sent for the demonstration agent and had him write on to Kingan & Co., the packing men, who sent a man there, and he bought a carload of hogs and shipped them away from my county. I am delighted to say that those hogs were sold at about the peak price, over 20 cents a pound on the foot at the depot at home, and they paid cash for them.

Mr. President, I do not mention that in order to draw attention to myself, of course, but merely to show our friends that there is a way for individuals to help their neighbors and thereby better their own condition. Tell the bankers out in the Northwest to get busy. If they have not the money they have credit, and in less than 12 months they can be eating hogs raised in their own pasture.

When are you going to stop coming here? In my State a few years ago we raised 1,600,000 bales of cotton. The next year we raised about 800,000 bales of cotton, the next year a little over 500,000 bales. In my own county during that time we raised 65,000 bales one year, and next year the crop dropped down to about 37,000 bales, and next year down to about 18,000 bales on account of the boll weevil and some unfavorable climatic conditions, and so forth. I know men who raised as much as a thousand bales of cotton one year, and the next year they raised 125 bales. I know one man who raised 26 bales of cotton with two plows, and the next year he raised 4 bales. I know a man who did not raise 1 bale of cotton to the plow.

Where are you going to stop? God knows I sympathize with the worker; but suppose the South comes here and asks the Government for aid because we raised cotton with which to make tents and uniforms and horse collars and automobile

covers, and so forth, and then when this deflation came on, brought about a good deal by the stupidity of the Government officials, our commodity declined from 43 cents down to 11 cents a pound—a greater decline than any other commodity had ever made in that space of time in history.

Talk about being hard up and not able to buy a pig! Those people were sold out completely. Nine thousand farmers in about two years left their farms in South Carolina and went to the cotton mills, to the towns, and public works. One acre out of every six in my State that was cultivated a few years ago was not cultivated last year. In all probability, Senators, we are not going to make enough cotton to supply the mills this year, or certainly in the very near future, unless the Creator relieves us of the boll weevil, because I do not think the Government is going to be active enough to do it. I fear that we have not discovered an effective remedy to eradicate that pest. Therefore, it will not be long until the people of the South can not exist by raising cotton. We are not going to perish, however, because we will raise something else; but when the mills of the North are shut down for the want of material with which to feed their spindles, that labor can not go and seek employment on 24 hours' notice nor on 30 days' notice.

There will not be enough employment there for them; and when they consume their little savings, which they have been able to save out of their daily toil, they will become dissatisfied, and the North and the South will join in coming to Congress and saying: "Give us \$100,000,000 to help support these people"; and we will bring people here not only to make you feel that we have suffered a great misfortune, but we will make you shed tears clear down to your toes.

Where are you going to stop? Had you not better stop now? I do not want to be a party to such unsound legislation. We indeed sympathize with the unfortunate, and we ought to do everything we can, legally and legitimately, to alleviate their misfortune; but we never will get anywhere when we turn the United States Treasury into a charitable institution. I shudder for future generations unless we are going to adhere more closely to the Constitution and sound governmental principles and attend to the things we were elected and sent here to attend to. The fact is that we stay here too much anyhow. We ought not to be here half the time we are. We ought to attend to our legitimate legislative business, investigate fraud wherever it comes up, expedite legislation, get through with it, and let business have a rest.

This bill will put up the price of bread, as I said, on my people, who suffered just as greatly as the wheat growers of the West, or more so. I have no intention of being unkind; but I have not the sympathy for a wheat grower that I have for a cotton grower, because wheat is cultivated and harvested by machinery, whereas cotton is cultivated to a very great extent by hand labor, and is harvested altogether by hand labor, as the Southern Senators know. It requires much more work, much harder work, than it does to raise wheat or to raise corn.

These are just some general ideas I have on the subject. This unrest is natural after all wars, until we can become restored to normalcy. The thing for our good friends out there to do is for every one of them to curtail their production of wheat. They should organize, as farmers all over the United States ought to organize, and if they can not get each one to reduce his acreage, then those who make less and who can not make ends meet will have to go into some other vocation. I looked up the statistics last night, and I find that the increase of wheat is no greater than the increase of the population of this country in the last 10 years. The great trouble with that section, as it is with our section in the South, is that we produce too much of one commodity. We have been slaves to this uneconomic way of farming; and on account of causes which I need not go into at this time the markets of the world have been closed or greatly curtailed, and we are not going to regain our prosperity as we should until those markets are again opened.

What the farmer needs, if I might be allowed to say so, is not so much regulatory laws as to be let alone and to have no unjust legislation pressing down upon the price of the commodity he grows. He should get more for what he raises; then he will be an independent citizen, as he is entitled to be. I need not go into the details of some of these unjust laws at this time, but I will do so in the future.

I feel that this bill and the one to follow it are the robust offspring of the baby bill that was hatched last week.

I have a bill coming along down the line, which I put in the hopper a day or two ago, which I think is sound and which I think would answer the purpose all these bills are intended to meet. It is a bill to employ the funds in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian to aid in the exportation of our raw mate-

rial. I find nothing in the Constitution which it would violate. I think it is sound. It would not only help us get rid of the surplus agricultural products we have in this country, particularly cotton and wheat, but it would help the people of Germany and Austria and Hungary to get on their feet. It would give employment to their people. They would use the \$100,000,000 funds that are impounded here temporarily as a revolving fund, and it would bring about a good feeling between those countries and our country. As soon as we settle those differences over these funds which arose during the war the matter can be finally adjusted. The Alien Property Custodian strongly recommends that bill. It is now before the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and of the House. I hope it will receive early consideration and a favorable report and that it will be enacted into law. I believe that if that were passed there would be no necessity for this bill and the one to follow it. It will quickly export surplus agricultural products and we will start a new season as we should.

I had thought of saying more about this matter, but Senators are business men and I know they would not loan their money in the manner in which the Government is asked to loan public money under this bill, and I do not believe we have any right to attend to the public business in any less safe manner than that in which we loan our own money.

As I said before, I deeply sympathize with all people who are in distress, or who imagine they are in distress, but if we hold up here the announcement that every time men do not succeed at home as they think they should, this is a place for them to come, where they will receive a ready ear and an open hand, we will constantly be making drains on the Treasury. While we want to be just to those people, yet there are other people who are toiling, who are laboring from January to January, who are paying taxes, who have obligations to meet, whose taxes are taken and loaned out in this unsafe, dangerous manner.

The way the money may be handled will depend altogether upon the honesty and the energy of the man receiving the fund. The Government will have no way to keep track of it, and if it had to keep track of it there would be an enormous expense put upon the Government, taken out of the taxpayer or somebody else. A farmer could not kill a pig without getting consent from Washington. When we stop to think that the United States Government has not a dollar except what it takes from the people by taxation or what it receives for our bonds, we should be exceedingly cautious how we vote on any of these matters.

Mr. President, I trust that we will not go further. I think the time to call a halt has come. There are other bills pending in Congress which will demand the expenditure of a great deal of money, which I have not favored; but if we are going to try to break the Treasury or to burden the people beyond their ability to exist, I do not know the end. All are going into debt too deep—individuals, National Government, and all subdivisions thereof. If business can not make ends meet, enterprise will stop and no one will be willing to create employment, hence all will suffer and after a while there will be none to pay taxes.

I am sorry this bill received a favorable report, and I trust Senators will seriously consider now where we are headed.

I will not speak of the political effect of this bill, but that might be considered. My people are in no position or humor for the price of flour or other commodities which they have to purchase to be raised. I have a small farm that is not being cultivated this year, because I feared it would not be profitable. This is sufficient funds to buy the electoral vote of many States.

The purpose which this bill seeks to remedy can be accomplished otherwise. I trust it will fail.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] seems to feel fearful and apprehensive that if this bill is passed it may cause a revolution. If we do have a revolution or any other kind of serious trouble, the first element to be called upon by the Government and the first to respond will be the American farmer.

To my mind, we owe the American farmer something. During the war and preceding the war, we well remember, the agencies of the Government carried on propaganda in behalf of raising more wheat, more food, more beef, more mutton, more pork, and for having meatless days and wheatless days. We should not forget that during the war we controlled the price of the farmer's wheat. It was said on the floor that he was not obliged to sell it. I remind the Senate of the law in force at that time relating to the hoarding of foodstuffs. Had he not sold it, he would have been amenable to very severe penalties for hoarding food.

While the farmer was using every effort of which he was capable in support of this Government and in support of our allies overseas, while his sons were serving on the field of

battle, the farmer's wife and his children who were not in the service were working and toiling in the fields to produce in order to save the situation.

During those days wages were very high. The price of everything the farmer had to buy was inflated. The farmer gave his support unstintingly, in the spirit of loyalty, in the spirit of upholding this Government, without regard to costs or expenses; and he did so in many instances—in most instances—without profit. To-day the farmer finds himself in distress; and he is appealing to Congress not for alms, not for charity, but for some agency which will enable him to get by.

Some Senators have expressed doubts about the security upon which it is proposed to advance moneys under the pending bill. There is nothing unusual about the provisions of this bill with reference to the extension of credits. There is nothing in the extension of credit as proposed that has not heretofore been in vogue through the banks of the country. The only difference between the pending bill and other bills which have been passed by the Congress in the matter of credit extensions to meet emergencies is that under the pending bill loans may be made to individuals instead of to corporations, instead of to co-operative associations or banks or other classes of credit concerns. Under the pending bill loans will be made to the individual.

The rate of interest provided in the bill is 2 per cent less than that which has been paid under former bills, because under the others the farmers were compelled to deal with third parties or intermediate agencies. That 2 per cent reduction in itself, carried over a period of five years, would be the equivalent of 10 per cent, or the equivalent of the margin which our loan agencies have been in the habit of taking, and it absorbs the difference in the hazard, which would of necessity result in favor of the farmer.

The situation is this, that under the pending bill loans are to be made, to be secured by livestock—cattle, hogs, or poultry—to farmers or renters of farms. The bill in itself assumes—and, of course, we must assume—that if money is loaned for the purchase of livestock it will be loaned only to individuals who are capable of taking care of livestock and who have conveniences and who have feed and hay. It is nothing unusual for a banker to loan money to a feeder to purchase livestock for fattening, basing the margin upon the feed which is to be fed to the cattle for fattening purposes. That has always been considered good security. Take, for instance, a loan on a cow. We will say that the cow costs \$50, if it is of a beef variety. That cow is fed and taken care of. It will produce a calf which, at the end of 12 months, under the present market, will probably bring \$30. That is a return of 60 per cent on the purchase price of the cow.

Can anyone say that is not good security? There is no better security in the world than the security on livestock, provided those producing it have the means to feed and take care of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BURSUM. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I would like to advise the Senator to sell that calf when it is 6 or 7 weeks old instead of keeping it until it is 12 months old. He would get more for it.

Mr. BURSUM. That may be true. That would give him the money all the sooner. I was not proposing to restrict the time to a year in which the increase might be sold. What I am attempting to show is that security on livestock, and particularly on breeding stock, is the best security in the world if those taking over the livestock have the means of taking care of it.

This is not a gift. This is not charity. So far as the Government is concerned, it is good business. It would give the benefits of a reasonable rate of interest to the borrower. I can not see why we should be so concerned or apprehensive about Government loans. When we say Government loans, that does not mean that the Government fund is any more sacred than any other fund. The people do not belong to the Government. The Government belongs to the people. What we are doing is in behalf of the people, and certainly in this case what we are attempting to do is in behalf of a people not only deserving but a large proportion of people who occupy a very large area of the country.

Our experience so far as loaning money on livestock is concerned has been pretty satisfactory. For instance, according to the report of the War Finance Corporation, the advances to banks and other loan agencies, made up to November 30, 1923, amounted to \$169,780,410.94. The balance outstanding on November 30, 1923, was \$43,702,169.44. To livestock loan com-

panies the advances up to November 30, 1923, amounted to \$80,095,671.90, while the outstanding balance on livestock loans on November 30, 1923, was \$29,494,480. This shows that out of the \$80,000,000 advanced more than \$51,000,000 had been repaid to the Government and covered back into the Treasury.

The War Finance Corporation advanced in Iowa, up to November 30, 1923, over \$24,000,000, and outstanding at that time there was \$5,617,566.59. Thus, out of \$24,000,000 loaned nearly \$20,000,000 has been repaid. In Kansas they borrowed less than \$5,000,000, and there was outstanding a little over \$1,000,000, 80 per cent having been repaid in Kansas. In Minnesota there were advances of \$12,551,815.20; outstanding, \$4,000,000; more than two-thirds having been repaid.

In Montana there was \$12,500,000 advanced; outstanding less than \$5,000,000, nearly two-thirds having been repaid. In Nebraska the advances were \$12,000,000; outstanding less than \$1,000,000, 90 per cent having been repaid. In North Dakota the advances were \$20,621,000, outstanding \$10,986,000; in South Dakota advances \$14,000,000, outstanding \$7,000,000. So that even in North and South Dakota 50 per cent of the moneys loaned have been repaid.

It has been said that the pressure for collection has been a little hasty; that it has in some cases left the country in a distressed condition, and that the loans should have been carried for a longer time. I think there may be some truth in that in view of the situation of the banks in the two Dakotas, Minnesota, Montana, and other Western States.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate and of the sponsors of the bill to this provision contained in it:

No loan shall, however, be made to any farmer who has overdue principal and interest or general obligations likely to result in early foreclosure of mortgages or other liens upon his farm lands or necessary farm equipment unless extension shall be granted by his creditors in such form as will give him a reasonable opportunity to work out his future and to get the ultimate benefit from such loan.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I have to leave the Chamber; otherwise I should not interrupt the Senator. The Senator referred to me as connected with farming. I desire to state that my individual means are very small, but I own some land and I have at least one farm that is not being cultivated because it is not profitable to do so.

Mr. BURSUM. Of course, the Senator may be so fortunate as to be in the position that it matters little, so far as getting along and making ends meet may be concerned, whether he farms or not, but all people are not in that situation.

Mr. DIAL. I was afraid I would lose more than I would make, and therefore I would not undertake it.

Mr. BURSUM. The Senator from South Carolina, I regret to see, is leaving the Chamber. He said cotton sold in the South at one time for 10 cents a pound. I remember that situation very well when cotton did sell at 10 cents a pound. The Government was appealed to for relief then, just as now. Congress renewed what was known as the War Finance Corporation act. Under that act one of the first loans which was made was upon cotton, \$10,000,000 being advanced to incorporated associations in one of the Southern States; I think Tennessee. The immediate result of that credit was that within a very few days cotton went up to 20 cents a pound. That simply demonstrates the stimulation that adequate credit can accomplish in times of distress and when there are no other means of relief.

I had just called the attention of the friends of the bill to the provision contained in it with reference to the limitation of those who may be eligible to obtain loans under its provisions. It is my understanding that the banks in North Dakota are in a very distressed condition. In fact, if I recall correctly, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORSECK], the author of the bill now pending, stated on the floor of the Senate that 95 per cent of the banks in North Dakota had failed, and said the same statement might be made with reference to South Dakota, Montana, and Idaho.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURSUM. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. May I correct the Senator? Did the Senator mean to say 95 per cent of the banks in North Dakota were closed?

Mr. BURSUM. That is what I understood the Senator from South Dakota to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. No; that is incorrect. The Senator from North Dakota is here and probably can inform us what was said. I do not know, but there is no condition like that there at all.

Mr. BURSUM. I am glad to know it is not that bad.

Mr. LADD. The official reports with reference to banks having failed up until early winter showed that 96 banks out of about 800 had closed their doors.

Mr. BURSUM. That is a very different situation.

Mr. KING. My understanding is that the 96 banks which failed were relatively small banks with small and impaired capital and improvident loans.

Mr. LADD. I do not think I can say that; but there were frozen loans, and many of the other banks have their loans frozen in the same way and are unable to liquidate and hence unable to tide over.

Mr. BURSUM. My attention has just been called to the statement of the Senator from South Dakota by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER]. What the senior Senator from South Dakota did say was that probably 95 per cent of the banks were practically broke. What he meant to say was that they were in no condition to extend any credit whatsoever. Is not that the true situation?

Mr. LADD. That is the correct situation, I think.

Mr. BURSUM. So I assume that most of the persons who are intended to be beneficiaries under this bill are probably indebted to banking concerns or to mortgage companies or loan companies and that their obligations may in the larger number of instances be past due. Under such circumstances those persons would not be eligible to the benefits of the bill unless extensions could be granted upon guaranties that would secure the debt from being foreclosed or the probability of being foreclosed on account of loans either on their land, on their equipment, or on other appurtenances essential to the conduct of their farms.

Under such a condition of affairs, it seems to me that not only is it necessary to extend credit to individual farmers but that it is highly essential that we should also do something toward rehabilitating and stabilizing the banks of the country, not only in North Dakota and South Dakota but all over the West and in every State where such a condition exists. I may say that so far as my State is concerned that nearly 50 per cent of the banks have failed; that 40,000 depositors are worrying about the safety of their savings and a likelihood of obtaining a settlement at any time within the near future. The result of this situation is that public confidence has been alienated from our banking institutions. Everyone knows that the only foundation upon which banking institutions can function, the only foundation upon which credit can be based and upon which it is based, is public confidence and faith. Without it the banks can not function. Not even the Government could function without faith. With all of the surplus gold which we have at this time, more than 50 per cent of the gold of the world, that surplus would mean nothing in the face of the alienation of the public confidence throughout the Nation.

It seems to me that the situation which now exists demands the serious attention of the Congress. Some say it is not the proper function of the Government or is it a proper procedure to intervene or interfere in rendering aid to bankers; that the banker takes his chances and that he must take care of himself. I have no great concern for the individual banker, and that is not the question; my concern is for the depositors. Who are the real owners, the real stockholders of our entire banking system if they be not the depositors? The depositor goes to the bank with the faith that his money will be properly taken care of; that it will be safely handled; that it will be forthcoming when needed. The wage earner saves his little mite and deposits his little surplus every month with the absolute confidence that his earnings are being taken care of and supervised by the Federal Government. He has a right to have faith in our banking institutions. Lack of confidence and faith is a serious matter. Fear on the part of the public is the hardest element to control. There is nothing so hard to control as a person's fear. One failure will bring on another failure. A lack of confidence spreads and spreads and spreads like a prairie fire, and unless checked it may spread all over the Nation.

I say that the integrity of the banking system itself is endangered by reason of the widespread alienation of the confidence of the public in our banking institutions. That condition is not local to my State, but also obtains in Arizona, Idaho, Montana, parts of Oklahoma, of Kansas, of Nebraska, of Iowa, and of Minnesota. Who can say that this is a local situation? How can a government function without a system of credit? How can people transact business in the absence of confidence and an agency of credit? Are we to go back to

the olden times of exchanging commodity for commodity and have no basis of exchange? It may be that in some instances, perhaps, banks have failed on account of mismanagement; in isolated cases, perhaps, they have failed from other causes; but, Senators, I am confident that as to the overwhelming number of banks which have failed the failures have been on account of no fault of the bankers themselves but on account of causes beyond their control.

To my mind, it is absolutely essential that this condition be remedied. It has been said that private corporations have been organized for the purpose of granting aid and relief to the Northwest, and that this agency will be extended to grant relief to the Southwest. Up to the present time I have not heard of any transactions or of anything actually having been done in their behalf. Furthermore, the purpose of the organization, as I understand, is to purchase good paper with adequate security. While such an agency might grant some relief and greatly aid the distress existing in certain districts, it will not cure the situation; it will not cure the evil which exists.

The great trouble with most of the banks, including many that are still open and others that have been closed, is that their capital has become impaired. There is only one way to rectify such a condition, namely, to repair the capital of the banks that can be repaired and which can be made solvent and are needed for the public service in their respective communities, and the business of which is sufficient to justify the re-opening of the banks for public service and placing them in a condition to recapture the confidence of the public.

This can be done, to my mind, only by an agency in possession of an intelligent appraisal of the condition of the securities and of the business possibilities of every bank in the country, and I know of no other agency in possession of those facts than the Comptroller of the Currency. The Comptroller of the Currency is in possession of intelligent information, of an absolute appraisal of every security contained in every national bank in the whole country, and I propose that we provide a reasonable appropriation, to be used under the supervision and control of the Comptroller of the Currency, for the purpose of stabilizing the banks of this country. I would take care of the State banks as well as the national banks, provided that the State banks submit to examination and audit and to regulations which the comptroller may prescribe.

There are many banks, perhaps, which can not be saved, which can not be reopened. That is a matter which must be left to those in authority, who are in a position to judge. We must trust those authorities to do that which is for the best welfare of the public and for all concerned. It is just as important that no bank which is worthy of being aided shall not fail to receive consideration and aid as it is that no unworthy institution shall be given any aid whatsoever. In cases where our financial institutions are not in such condition that it is practicable to place them upon a certified solvency list, so to speak, and give them a certificate of confidence, under such circumstances the best thing that can happen for all concerned is to liquidate; but if we are to stem the tide of alienation of the confidence of the public in our banking institutions, something must be done whereby public confidence will be restored.

For that purpose I have introduced an amendment, which is pending, to the present bill. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I hope this bill will pass. It is a fair bill. There is nothing unreasonable about it. I do not agree with the views of my distinguished friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] about its effect on livestock.

I am of the opinion that if this measure is enacted into law it will tend to stabilize livestock and will create a better market for livestock, something that surely everyone will admit is a much-desired condition in this country.

There is no surplus in livestock in this country. The only reason why values have become demoralized is the fact of the wholesale liquidation of breeding cattle, even calves, which have been sent to the slaughterhouse under foreclosure, under the pressure of demands for the liquidation of indebtedness. That is the only reason why livestock is so low in value. I do not know of a Western State that has within its borders 50 per cent of the livestock it had a few years ago. There is no doubt but that within a year or two the people of this country will find that unless something has been done to preserve the livestock industry they will pay the penalty and they will pay a high price for beef and mutton. The only reason for the depression has been the lack of orderly marketing and lack of ability of the raisers and owners to control the distribution and sale of their products.

In my opinion the passage of this bill will create a healthier condition and will stimulate the market price of all kinds of livestock.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Fess	Keyes	Shields
Borah	Fletcher	Ladd	Shipstead
Brandegee	Frazier	Lodge	Simmons
Brookhart	George	McKellar	Smith
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Smoot
Bruce	Glass	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Gooding	Mayfield	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Stephens
Capper	Harreld	Norris	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Conzens	Harrison	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Hefflin	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Philips	Warren
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	Watson
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	Willis
Ferris	Kendrick	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, before this measure is further discussed it occurs to me that the bill is not properly here. I therefore raise the point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Rule XVI, paragraph 1, page 20, provides that all general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Appropriations Committee. We changed the rules of the Senate some years ago in order to harmonize them with the Budget. Therefore this provision was made, that all general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Appropriations Committee. This bill itself, as the Chair will see if he will examine it, originally provided for an authorization to make it in order; but that has been stricken out by the committee and it now provides for an appropriation directly from the Treasury, which, I maintain, makes it out of order, and it should go to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the point raised by the Senator from North Carolina is not a new one. It has been frequently raised, and always overruled. This is not in any sense a general appropriation bill. We have many precedents where the point has been raised and interposed against a bill carrying a specific appropriation and not a general appropriation bill.

The rule invoked, or attempted to be invoked, by the Senator from North Carolina applies only to the annual supply bills, general appropriation bills carrying appropriations for the support and administration of certain departments of our Government. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has called my attention to the joint resolution which was passed just a few days ago, introduced by the present Presiding Officer [Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair], carrying an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to relieve the drought-stricken region of New Mexico. The same point of order was made then and was properly overruled by the Chair. It does not matter whether the bill carries \$100,000,000 or \$50,000,000 or \$1,000,000 or any other sum that is proposed by the various amendments; the principle is the same in either case. The question is whether it is a specific piece of legislation or a general appropriation bill.

I contend, Mr. President, that at no time has such a point of order as that made by the Senator from North Carolina been sustained.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Oregon can cite a single precedent where a point of order of this kind has been made. Points of order have been overruled in the case of special appropriation bills, but the joint resolution introduced by the present Presiding Officer and passed a few days ago was different from the bill now pending. That was a measure making an appropriation for use in one State. This provides for a general appropriation. I suppose the present Presiding Officer has read the pending bill, but I will say that it is very general in its nature, seeking to appropriate a large sum of money. It does not apply to any particular State. It does not describe any particular State or any particular person. Therefore it is general in its nature and subject to the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I submit that because Rule XVI uses the language, "All general appropriation bills," would not necessarily make it apply to a bill like this. The term "general appropriation bills" as used in the rule means general supply bills, and I submit that under the precedents established since the adoption of that rule the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry has the right to bring in an appropriation in a special bill. It has no right to report a general appropriation bill, because Rule XVI expressly provides that that can not be done, and the decision of the Chair the other day was with respect to the joint resolution in charge of the Senator who now presides over the Senate, which was on all fours with the pending bill.

While it is true that that applied to one section, the situation would not have been changed if it had applied to the whole United States. It was an appropriation; it was not an authorization. To that joint resolution the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] first made a point of order and he relied upon Rule XVI. After the matter was discussed the Senator from New York, who is a good parliamentarian, recognized that the point was not well taken, and agreed to the decision of the Chair that his point of order was not sustainable.

I submit that this point of order is not well taken, and that in the case of bills like this the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has the right to authorize the appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the point which has just been raised, but I notice that while the bill as first introduced authorized that appropriations might be made, in the amendment which has been reported by the committee, which was not in the bill when it was first called up, an attempt is made to directly appropriate. I do not raise any question as to the general point of order at this time, because it is a very much debated matter, but if we are to have a Committee on Appropriations, and if appropriations are to be made, and made promptly, the power should rest in the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate, and the appropriations should then come in regular order.

Since this subject has been brought up I think I ought to say that if this bill is to be passed, I shall, at the proper time, ask to have that matter changed by offering an amendment restoring the language "authorized to be," which will bring about the result desired whatever might be said of the other question.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator then supports the point of order?

Mr. WARREN. No; I am not discussing the point of order, but I am stating what would be good legislation, what legislation we must pass in the long run, without any doubt. If we follow the policy of attempting to provide in special bills permanent appropriations for years to come we will get nowhere; we can proceed in no regular way to do business, providing in the first instance for the revenue, and, second, for the proper disposition of it.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the situation the rule was made to meet—to get bills before the proper committees and to act in harmony with the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). The language of the rule is, "All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations," and so forth. The question is presented in two aspects. The Chair does not recall that the one now suggested by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has ever been presented before. There is a distinction between what is commonly called a general appropriation bill and a bill providing for a special appropriation. The Senator from North Carolina raises the point whether the pending bill carrying a general appropriation comes within the meaning of this language stated in the rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the rule itself was intended to include only the general appropriation bills, which are well defined, carrying general appropriations for the various departments; but the Chair will be glad to submit the question to the Senate, if the Senator from North Carolina would prefer to have that done.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will let the Chair decide it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I think the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] desires to discuss the amendment briefly before the vote is taken. Just now he is absent from the Chamber, but I have sent word to him, and while awaiting his return I will occupy the floor for a few minutes.

Mr. KING entered the Chamber.

Mr. McLEAN. The junior Senator from Utah is now present.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator from Connecticut the floor?

Mr. McLEAN. I will be glad to surrender the floor to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I do not want to take the floor at this time.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, at this time I would like to offer an amendment to the pending bill. In the amendment

of the committee, on page 5, line 13, after the word "hereby," I propose to insert the words "authorized to be," so that it will read "is hereby authorized to be appropriated." Also, in line 23, on the same page, after the word "hereby," I propose to insert the words "authorized to be," so as to read "hereby authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator merely wants to have the amendment printed, I take it. There is already an amendment pending.

Mr. WARREN. I simply give notice that I shall offer those amendments at the proper time.

Mr. HARRISON. I was in hopes the pending amendment could be gotten out of the way so that we could get down to the bill itself.

Mr. WARREN. I am not asking for the present consideration of my amendments. I am offering them so that they may be taken up when we reach that point in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments to the amendment of the committee will lie upon the table. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to occupy very much time in the discussion of this bill, because I realize that nothing I can say will change the view of any Member of this body; but for the sake of the Record I do wish to present, very briefly, my objections to the bill.

When the bill was being discussed on yesterday, I endeavored to secure from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. NORRIS] his view of the broader scope of the bill, and the conditions which might warrant its support. I did not have very much success in that endeavor. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] admitted he knew much more about the bill than I did, and with that proposition I agreed. I was in search of information, which I did not get from the Senator, which seems to me to be rather important, when we propose to take something like \$90,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States at a time like this, and pass it over to the Secretary of Agriculture to be disposed of as outlined in the bill. I am frank to say I find nothing in the bill which provides for any—I was going to say sane administration of the act.

I did suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that in other sections of the country there might be conditions not dissimilar to those which prevail in Nebraska. I happen to know, as we all know, that the agricultural interests of the country have been at a low ebb for some time. We know the reasons why. The dairy business in the East is unprofitable at the present time, and has been for many years, and I was wondering whether the originators of this scheme had taken into consideration the fact that there might be other sections of the country where the need was as great as the need in the sections mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska, if not greater.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection I suggest that in certain counties of my own State the farmers raised only about one-fifth of a crop of cotton this last year, and the situation of the cotton farmers in those counties is very serious indeed. Of course, the bill would not apply to them any more than it would apply to the farmers of the Senator's State.

Mr. McLEAN. I know something of the potato growers in the East, especially in Maine, and that a year ago the average price of potatoes in the country was much less than the production cost and there were very serious losses on that account.

I did not get very much information from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but happily, in the course of the discussion, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] offered a suggestion which it seems to me might well be considered by the Senate. I had stated that I thought that in most lines of agricultural products there was either overproduction or underconsumption, and that due to the high cost of machinery, the price of labor, and perhaps the spread, the agricultural interests of the country were generally at a low ebb. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who represents one of the four States which the Senator from Nebraska informed the Senate would be benefited by this bill—and there were only four States, if I remember correctly—called the attention of the Senate to the conditions in the State of Montana. I want to quote to the Senate what he said.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that this appropriation is for the purpose primarily and principally of reestablishing in

these States a diversity of production, principally in the dairying industry. The Senator from Montana said:

With the kindness of the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Connecticut seems to be apprehensive about overproduction of dairy products. I would like to say for his information that last year there were produced at Miles City, Mont., about a million pounds of butter, a very considerable portion of which was sold in the Orient, in China, Japan, and the Philippine Islands; so that is a field in which the opportunities for expansion are indefinite.

After listening to the very eloquent and earnest appeals of those Senators that Congress should go to the assistance of Montana and the Dakotas and one other State because the farmers were in such straits, it occurred to me that if the dairymen of Montana were at the present time producing butter in large quantities which they could sell in Japan and China and the Philippine Islands at a profit there could be no real reason why Congress should take \$50,000,000 out of the Treasury for the purpose of providing the farmers of Montana with extra capital to carry on this profitable business.

A little later on the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] made a very intelligent statement as to what he thought the bill should and would accomplish if properly administered, which did not altogether agree with the statement of the Senator from Nebraska. If I remember correctly—the Senator from North Dakota is present and will correct me if I am in error—his position was that the object of the bill was not to enable the farmers of North Dakota to establish commercial dairies in a general sense of the term, but to enable the farmers here and there who did not happen to have any cows or chickens or pigs to obtain a very small number—two or three cows, or something of that sort—in order that the farmers could have this source of food for the sustenance of their families, and that it was not intended in any way to establish large commercial dairies. That is a strong appeal to anyone. But, Mr. President, it does not seem to me that we ought to go into the Treasury of the United States and appropriate any such sum of money as is sought here for that purpose. If that is necessary, if there is real distress in North Dakota, I would be among the first to vote to relieve it.

I know the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] based his conclusion largely, and so stated, upon the distinguished professors and economists who reported to the committee. One of them mentioned was a Doctor Willard, whose statement was put into the Record by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORRIS] when he discussed the bill. The statement is in fine print. I doubt if very many Senators have read it. It occupies two or three columns in the Record. I am satisfied that any Senator who would take the trouble to read this report would come to the conclusion that there is no real distress in North Dakota. There are farmers there who are heavily in debt, who can not pay their interest, and who do not pay their interest. The banks are worrying about that. The banker is the one who is concerned about that. These gentlemen, I take it, are still in possession of their farms and they have plenty to eat and comfortable clothes to wear and comfortable shelter. I gather that from the statement to which I have referred, and I am going to take the time of the Senate to read some portions of it because it is very interesting. It goes to the real condition upon which the request is made.

I desire to say that I shall be glad to yield the floor if the Senator from Utah so desires.

Mr. KING. No; I am very much interested in the Senator's discussion, and he is elaborating the subject much better than I could.

Mr. McLEAN. I shall have to disagree with the Senator from Utah in regard to that.

I want to call attention to what Doctor Willard said, and I shall have to read a considerable portion of his statement:

I wish to turn now for just a few minutes to a short discussion of a survey that we made near the central part of the State for the very purpose of determining the necessity and the applicability of this \$1,000-loan proposition as embodied in the proposed legislation. We took a corps of 12 men, who are trained men, who understand how to get this sort of information, to this region, and we completely covered three townships and half of a fourth, taking every farmer without regard to who he was, and got a set of detailed information from him as to his cropping system, his amount of stock, the various classes, his net worth; that is, his assets of all sorts and liabilities, consisting of first, second, and third mortgages, his chattels, personal notes, back taxes, interest past due, etc. We verified those liabilities with the financial representative of those farmers and found that they had given in general a very true report, and some of the information contained in that survey I will touch upon, and you may find in these

sheets the detailed information, which you can consider at your leisure. That region is representative of probably more than two-thirds of the State of North Dakota, and also is applicable to parts of Montana and South Dakota.

The average size of farms in this region was 575 acres.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether that is North Dakota or South Dakota?

Mr. McLEAN. It is North Dakota, I assume.

The average size of farms in this region was 575 acres, and 217 acres were in wheat, and this comprised 47 per cent of the crop area of those farms.

Now, note this, Mr. President:

The average yield of wheat for five years was slightly over 8 bushels on these farms, and for this year 5.6 bushels.

It must be that many acres in that State have been developed and put down to wheat which should not have been. These men are intelligent men, there is no question about that. Most of them are economists by necessity and statesmen by training. They are close to the Canadian boundary. These gentlemen must know that just north of the border, a few miles distant, they produce 20 bushels or more to the acre. Now, I submit that that is a condition which Congress can not remedy. It is a serious natural disadvantage, but it is one that can not be remedied by any diversification of products in my opinion. If it is not suitable for wheat, can it be assumed that that section of the country can support commercial dairies which require silos, subjected as they are to an uncertain rainfall and a soil that produced last season but 5 bushels of wheat to the acre? This is an emergency, it is stated, and that is true, but in so far as that phase of the subject is concerned it is an emergency as permanent as the State of North Dakota. It is there to-day and it will continue to be there as long as the earth turns on its axis.

I continue my quotation:

Of all the crops produced, corn, which occupied about 11 per cent of the crop area, maintained its average five-year yield of approximately 24 bushels to the acre.

Now, I do not know whether that is a fair average yield for corn or not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is very low, extraordinarily low.

Mr. McLEAN. I know that in Connecticut we expect to get 60 bushels to the acre, but Connecticut, I think, holds the record for producing the largest quantity of corn to the acre of any State in the Union. Twenty-four bushels of corn to the acre at the price which the farmer gets is, of course, not remunerative.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STANFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Before the Senator leaves the point of the average acreage per farm in the States under discussion, permit me to invite his attention to a table which I have here, which shows that on January 1, 1920, in North Dakota, where a number of counties were selected, in Grand Forks County the average acre per farm was 408.3; in Foster County, 509.6; in Morton County, 569.7; and in Slope County, 627.2 acres. In South Dakota, in Potter County, the average was 777.9 and in Harding County 1,352.8 acres. In Montana the average in Sheridan County was 480 acres; Toole County, 611 acres; Garfield County, 571 acres; Carter County, 652 acres. So that the Senator will see that the average in North Dakota is approximately 500 acres, in South Dakota the average is about seven or eight hundred acres, and in Montana a hasty computation would show an average of perhaps 600 acres.

Mr. McLEAN. The farms are large. I am merely calling attention to the fact that no matter what the capital of the farmer may be, the land is such that it is very difficult for the farmers to produce anything that will return a profit.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut expresses a very indifferent opinion about the value of our country out there. I am reminded that Daniel Webster who once represented in the Senate the neighboring State of the Senator from Connecticut, expressed a similar indifferent opinion about the entire country west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. McLEAN. When I went to school a large portion of the State of Montana was marked on the map as a portion of the "great American desert," and perhaps I have not been fair to the Senator's State. I do not know whether or not the Senator was in the Chamber when I called attention to his statement yesterday in which he said that the farmers of

Montana were producing a surplus of butter and marketing it in China, I assume at a profit.

Doctor Willard goes on to say that:

There were 21 farms out of the total 106 farms that had no brood sows whatever; there were 48 out of 106 that had 2 or less; out of 106 farms there were 13 who did raise some sheep and 88 per cent raised no sheep at all. There were 14 farms that had less than 50 head of poultry, and there were 54 farms, or more than 50 per cent, that had less than 100 poultry, which is about the lowest economic unit for our conditions.

There were 50 farms that had less than five milch cows.

He does not state how many they had, but if they had four they had about as many as the New England farmer had when he had to meet western competition.

Mr. President, I came into this world just as the homespun age was going out. I prize the recollection, but I would not again want to go through with the experience. When the great fertile fields of the West were opened up they drove the New England farmer out of the production of beef and hogs and sheep and grain, and his activities were limited to dairying. It was a pretty serious experience for a good many years. In my boyhood what we did not grow or make on the farm we went without. I question if we would be better off to-day if in those days Congress had come to our assistance and done what it could to deaden and destroy the spirit of self-reliance and individual responsibility which brought us out of our dilemma in very fair shape.

Doctor Willard further states:

Of 61 owners, 52 reported that they had barns and other buildings; and I might say that this section was visited by a terrific storm during the last year which almost completely demolished a few farmsteads, which accounts for the fact that not all owners of farms are now equipped with buildings, because it is rather the exception that they do not have barns for their work stock at least which are capable of housing some more additional livestock.

I have no doubt the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] used good judgment when he obtained the rule which requires the printing of quotations in invisible type, but it makes them rather difficult to read. However, I am able to read this:

Twenty-one out of 61 owner farms reported tractors and 47 reported automobiles.

The average sales from these farms, that is the 578-acre farms, amounted to only \$968 a year. It is very important that we shall know how much of that was net profit. If the aggregate return from these farms was \$968 a year and there was any profit, it seems to me that the farmers ought to be in a position to buy two or three cows, a few chickens, and a pig or two. I take it, their interest has been overdue a good while, and whether they are pressed for payment or not, I do not know. I am glad so many of them are able to own automobiles.

I am not dealing with this subject, I hope, in a spirit of captious criticism. Before I conclude I am going to call attention to the principle which is involved in this bill. It does not seem to me that, taking the statement of the learned gentleman who made the investigation upon which the committee largely based its findings, there is any such condition in that section as will warrant an appropriation of this character in order to meet an emergency that Congress can not control. An emergency that will continue as long as the natural disadvantages of climate and soil continue.

I will repeat, farming as a whole there and throughout this country is at a low ebb. The cotton men are having better days just now, but it is only a short time since the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] called our attention to conditions which were most distressing. Not only agricultural conditions but conditions in all other activities are subject to their ups and downs. Certain sections may be prosperous at times, and then whenever overproduction comes or for some other cause prices drop.

I wish to repeat that if the farmers of North Dakota were suffering for want of the necessities of life I would say, "Find out who they are and make the contribution direct to relieve the distress; but do not adopt a proposal that, in my judgment, will defeat its own purpose and in the long run be regretted by the very men who propose it to-day." I say that, Mr. President, because this legislation violates the fundamental and vital principle upon which the social and industrial life of this Nation is based. In the first place, it takes \$50,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and gives it to the Secretary of Agriculture, and authorizes and empowers

him to use it in direct competition with the existing credit merchants of the country, to compete with the Federal reserve system, to compete with the Federal farm-loan system, to compete with the intermediate-credits system, to compete with the State banks, directly or indirectly; and the capital which is represented, the amount of money that is taken out of the Treasury, is more than the combined capital of the Federal reserve system and the land-bank system when they were formed.

But that is not the worst feature of this bill, Mr. President. It takes this large sum of money out of the Treasury for the express purpose of repairing the capital of farmers who have failed, to enable them to compete with their next-door neighbors whose methods have been measurably successful. I do not know what it would be called. It certainly is not individualism, and it would be difficult to find an advocate of socialism who will say that it is not extremely offensive to his view of what true paternalism should be. He thinks that the Government should take control of production and transportation, and he gives his reasons for it; but I have yet to hear of a Socialist who advocates taking large sums of money out of the Public Treasury for the express purpose of permitting individuals who have failed to compete with individuals whose methods have succeeded in private occupations.

Of course the trouble is one which we all recognize. It is a pretty hard one to remedy. I have heard it stated that with our improved agricultural implements one man can cultivate as many acres to-day as three men could cultivate before the introduction of the power machines. Consider for a minute what that means. It means that the farmers to-day can produce as large a quantity of food products as could have been produced in 1860 if the entire population of the country had been engaged in farming.

I take it there is not a State in this Union that could not produce enough foodstuffs to maintain its population and have a surplus. I have heard it stated that we could easily feed a billion people. I think the two States of Florida and California could produce enough citrus fruits to supply the normal wants of a billion people. This is not only so with agriculture, but it is so with almost every industry where the conditions permit reasonable economic manufacture.

Congress can not regulate production in this country. Marketing associations may, in a measure, stabilize the price of a product if the production is constant, but only under such conditions, and the instant any industry shows an attractive profit there will be overproduction. Our acreage is so enormous that marketing associations can not control the price where there is overproduction. If the parties who own and control the means of production are unable to control it, how can the Government assist in any material way unless it goes the full length, confiscates, owns, and manages all the farm lands of the country, and allots to every man the number of acres which he may cultivate?

I do not believe we are ready for that. My impression is that the average American citizen would rather go along under the old régime for a little while yet. Rising and falling prices are natural. A pretty wise man once said that they were the romance of trade. I sometimes think that with the love for variety which is inherent in any active, red-blooded man worthy of the name, he would rather take his chances under the system that has brought us so far on the road to comfortable prosperity, especially in view of the fact that every community and every nation that has tried the paternalistic method of controlling prices has gone to the dogs, never to return.

Mr. President, I do not want to criticize, and I am not going to criticize, the purposes or the motives of the gentlemen who are supporting this legislation. I know that environment has a great deal to do with the convictions of honest men; and if I lived in the Dakotas or in Montana or any one of these States that is situated far distant from markets, that has to contend with the natural disadvantages of that location, I should feel that it was my duty to do everything I could to ameliorate conditions; and it may be that the effect of environment would be so strong after a time that I could become convinced that a proposal such as that embodied in this bill would result in a permanent benefit.

If I know anything about the history of such remedies, however, if the law of supply and demand is to be left operative, it is my firm conviction that this little sop which each farmer can receive, but which in its total amounts to a colossal sum, will be a foundation for the creation of still greater necessities; and, the precedent once being established, we shall go where all our predecessors have gone, and the people who receive these benefits will regret it in the long run.

The distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] is in the Chamber. Some time ago I read a pur-

ported interview which he had with a reporter of the New York Herald, in which he said that in his opinion the trouble with the farmer was that he had had too much credit, and that what he wanted was a market; and I said to myself: "Newspaper reports to the contrary notwithstanding"—and the Senator had been criticized somewhat in the East—"a Daniel has come to judgment in the Senate of the United States." It is what I have been maintaining for 10 years in my humble and ineffective way.

Why, Mr. President, when we drafted the Federal reserve act and based our currency upon self-liquidating commercial paper I felt that it would be a mistake to make an exception in favor of the farmer and render six months' agricultural paper eligible for rediscount, but I was overruled by the committee. What happened? Take it in 1920, just before prices began to drop.

The bankers were anxious to make money. The farmers were anxious to sell their crops at the highest possible price; and when the price fabric began to tremble they got their paper renewed, held on to their products, and they went down, and the farmer went out. If the banks had not been tempted to make money, and in turn invited the farmers to renew their paper—in other words, if the farmers of the country in 1920 had been compelled to take in fall, reduce their obligations—they would have done so and they would have sold a very large portion of their products at a profit. The farmer should have reasonable and seasonable accommodations for the production of his crop, and I have advocated every measure looking to that end; but if a farmer wants money for one, two, or three years, he should borrow it from a man who has money to lend for one, two, or three years.

Credits have been made easy. I do not object to that; but the Senator from Minnesota is everlastingly right when he says that the farmer has had too much credit and that what he needs is a market. I am willing to go to any length to which Congress can go that will help him to obtain markets; but you can repeal the Sherman Act, you can give the farmers permission to combine and cooperate, you can go to any extent that you please legitimately, and with the enormous total of fertile acres in this country the farmer will find that the only way in which he can control his markets is to go to the foundation and control his production.

Mr. McNARY. Can he do that?

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Oregon intimates that he can not do it, and I reply, and repeat, that Congress can do it in only one way, and that is by taking possession of the farms, allotting to each farmer the number of acres he can cultivate. If there is any other way I would like to have some of the Senators who are interested in this bill suggest it, and the Senator from Oregon would oppose that method as strongly as I would.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. The Senator is well aware of the fact that we farmers have been educated to produce more. We have paid taxes to support agricultural colleges for experimental purposes, and also to tell us to produce more; and we have done so. The Senator knows we have produced so much that we can not sell it. When it came to controlling, we have tried for years to organize, to have orderly marketing, have we not?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. The Senator agrees to that. But have we had any assistance from the Government of the United States and the different State governments? No; we have had no assistance whatever, until within the last few years they have begun to wake up to the fact that we need a little help, too.

I want to put the Senator right about another thing. He referred to what I said to a newspaper man. I will ask the Senator not to take his seat; I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. McLEAN. I want the Senator to make a speech. I want to hear him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I was right when I stated to the newspaper man that we have had too much credit. I stand on that now. But consider the shape we farmers in the Northwest are in to-day, when a good many banks have failed, and those in business to-day are not in a position to loan, for instance, \$200 or \$300 to a farmer who wants to start diversification. Therefore, I made my talk yesterday along that line, and if the Senator was in the Chamber yesterday he noticed that I explained that we have so much money borrowed now that we can hardly pay the interest on what we have already borrowed. But there is some way to get out of it, if we go in and milk cows and raise hogs and poultry.

It might be, if we go into the market, that prices will fall. I understand the price of eggs is falling now; that you can get them for 36 and 40 cents a dozen in Washington to-day. But if there is a farmer who has three or four cows, and milks those cows and takes care of them, he can go into town and get a cream check in order to support him and his family for a week or two, can he not?

Mr. McLEAN. I agree to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. That will help. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORRICK] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] stated that there are farms and farms in their States which have not on them a cow or a hen or a hog. That is why we are asking help. We are not asking for anything unreasonable at all. We want a little bit of help.

What is \$50,000,000 for this great Government of ours? It is not a drop in the bucket to what we have been giving to many organizations. I want to say to the Senator from Connecticut that the farmers have not been sufficiently represented in this body, but the manufacturers and the bankers and the big interests have been represented in this body. The small banks are broke because we raised wheat in North Dakota and Montana and did not get anything for it so that we could pay our bills, and pay the bankers on top of that. We all know it, and it is about time to get a knife and cut away the cancerous sore on the American public up there in the Northwest to-day, and we want the help of the Senator in doing it.

Mr. McLEAN. I understand the Senator's views. I heard portions of his address. I think I am familiar with the sister bill to this, of which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is the author, which is intended to stabilize the market for wheat and various other products. If I am wrong about that, the Senator will correct me.

What does it propose to do? I have been a protectionist all my life, upon the theory that if we protect our American producers against ruinous competition it will stimulate domestic competition, and, in the long run, the American consumer will be better off than he would be if we let foreign competition drive the American out of business, in which event the American people would be subjected to any price the foreigner wished to charge. The Senator will follow me, I think.

But here is a proposition which would eliminate domestic competition. It proposes, as I understand it, to take \$100,000,000, or perhaps \$200,000,000, out of the Treasury. I do not know whether the control is to be given to the Secretary of Agriculture or not, but probably it is. If I were the Secretary of Agriculture, with any such trust impending, I should resign as quickly as I could find a pen, because if he does not he will be investigated and fired before he has been in office six months. It is a colossal undertaking and responsibility which is beyond the capacity of any single individual; but the bill proposes to use machinery to purchase and hold the surplus product of wheat. If I am wrong about that, the Senator will correct me.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I doubt the desirability of diverting the legislative mind from the Norbeck bill to the bill I introduced, but inasmuch as I have been challenged by the Senator from Connecticut to explain the bill I will say that he is entirely wrong as to every provision of the bill which he has mentioned. It is not to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. There are to be two commissions. One commission is to have the active administrative things to handle. There is to be a larger body, of which the Secretary of Agriculture is to be one of eight members, which will define the policy of the corporation to be formed. Little, if any, responsibility is to be thrown upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

As to the other proposition, the bill does not purport to authorize the purchase of any wheat or any other basic agricultural commodity, defined as such in the bill, for the purpose of storing and holding. Anything purchased is to be purchased only for exportable surplus, and it can not be used in the domestic market. It is to be sold in an orderly way in the foreign market. The losses sustained thereby are to be absorbed by the higher prices which the article brings in the domestic market.

That is the difference between this and any other scheme, many of which have been proposed, to buy wheat in the open domestic market and store it and hold it, to increase the price of that which is given to the public for consumption. This would do that, not for the purpose of holding but to provide for the resale in foreign markets, where the wheat is now disposed of. If it were not that my attention has been called to

those two propositions, I did not intend to confuse the minds of Senators with a discussion of the export bill.

I think many mistakes have been made in the discussion of this bill when reference is made to the other bills. Those who are opposing this measure have attempted to bring in a discussion regarding other bills than the one before the Senate now for its consideration. I am for the pending bill, if I may say just a word here.

I am not for all the amendments, but I am for the general purpose of the bill, and perhaps I may address myself briefly to that. In some way, at some time, I am for what is known as the Norris bill and for this other bill to which reference has been made, namely, Senate bill 2012, which happens to bear my name, because I introduced it and had something to do with its fashioning and general purposes. I believe that will bring the most immediate relief to agriculture and agriculturists, who produce the basic articles described and defined in the bill. But that is a large and comprehensive matter. Many complexities are found in its provisions. A great effort must be made properly to administer it. At some day, and on an appropriate occasion, when that bill is before the Senate for consideration, I intend to speak upon the subject at length; but as for that matter, we must bide the time, and on this particular occasion I want to remind the Senator from Connecticut that every reference he has made to the bill shows plainly that he is not conversant with its many provisions.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator has touched upon the administrative features of the bill and I am not thoroughly informed as to those features, but the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced this subject, insisting that something should be done to stabilize the price of the farmers' product, if possible.

I will ask the Senator from Oregon if the purpose of his bill, and the only purpose, is not to stabilize the price of wheat?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that word "stabilize" has been used in so many ways and has so many different meanings that I do not know whether the bill is intended to stabilize or not. But I do know its purpose is this, as expressed in the bill, to give the farmers' products mentioned in the bill a fair exchange value with other commodities in other industries and in other fields, so that the farmer will be restored in his purchasing power to the same position he occupied before the war, namely, to a parity with the manufacturing industries of the New England States. I think that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. McLEAN. I think the Senator has not answered my question. I assume that the purpose of the bill is to raise the price of wheat above what it would be if the law of supply and demand were left in free operation. That being so, I would like to ask the Senator what he is going to do if his bill enables the American farmer to produce wheat at a profit—and we can raise in this country wheat enough to feed a billion people? What kind of a burden does he think he will have on his hands in a few years, when the Government takes money out of the Treasury to fix the price of wheat for the farmer, so that he can raise it at a profit?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, again the Senator from Connecticut shows his want of knowledge of the purpose of the bill. It does not provide for taking any money out of the Treasury of the United States permanently to raise wheat, or to encourage the raising of wheat.

Mr. McLEAN. Permanently?

Mr. McNARY. The Government is to furnish the nucleus to start the processes provided in this bill. The money is all returnable to the Treasury of the United States. All the benefits are to come out of the producers' pockets alone. The Government is simply asked to supply the machinery, or the mechanics, by which the farmer can do that thing for himself which he is unable to do now, and which the manufacturer is able to do, under a high protective tariff system.

Mr. McLEAN. The Government starts the ball with the insignificant sum of \$100,000,000, does it not?

Mr. McNARY. I would say the significant sum of \$100,000,000; yes.

Mr. McLEAN. As a starter; and if it succeeds, it is going to protect or stabilize the price of wheat, so that the farmers can continue to raise it and sell it at a profit. If it does not do that, what is it good for; and if it does do that, what sort of a burden will we have on our hands when the farmers of the country realize that the only thing in which they can make money is wheat? We raised wheat in Connecticut during the war, and as we have nothing now that is paying an attractive price in Connecticut in the agricultural line, when the gentleman fixes the price of wheat so we can make a good profit, I think we shall return to the growing of wheat extensively.

Mr. McNARY. It is difficult to pursue a question with a very charming colleague who knows nothing about the bill.

Mr. McLEAN. I am trying to ascertain. If the bill does not stabilize the price of wheat, what does it do and what is it good for?

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator would studiously devote about two hours to a study of the bill he would not be propounding to me these most puerile questions.

Mr. McLEAN. Since I have been chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency I have annually studied proposals all of them twin sisters or twin brothers to the proposal now submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. That again shows the Senator's lack of familiarity with the pending bill.

Mr. McLEAN. I am pretty familiar, I think, with the bill and its purposes. I am trying to ascertain from the Senator what he and the other friends of the farmers are going to do when the Government has started the machinery that will stabilize and fix the price of any product so that the producer of it can always sell it at a profit.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for properly classifying me as a friend of the farmer. There has been no bill similar to this one that has ever been brought to the attention of Congress, irrespective of the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has at one time been chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. If the Senator had read the bill, that statement would not have been made by him. The fact that this would increase the production of wheat to a point where it had passed the power of consumption is easily answered. There is a provision in the bill that provides that the price shall descend as rapidly as the production of wheat ascends until they reach an equitable level, which will operate as a stop to further production.

Mr. McLEAN. And a profitable level.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the Senator from Connecticut is not familiar with that provision because he has not read the bill. That is self-evident.

Mr. McLEAN. Oh, yes; I have read the bill.

Mr. McNARY. As to the question of overproduction, if we are capable under a fair stimulus to increase the production of wheat sufficiently to meet the demands of the country in time of war, we certainly should be able to control the production at a time like this, with the proper stimulus. The Senator does not know, but I am going to tell him, that the largest production of wheat this country has ever produced was in 1915, when there were 1,172,000,000 bushels produced. Not since that time have we approached that figure, and that was two years before we entered the war. Under all the stimuli, patriotic and congressional, calculated to produce cheaper bread and more wheat this country never produced as much as 900,000,000 bushels, and our average annual production has been around 776,000,000 bushels, showing clearly that any little stimulus to wheat, whereby we put it on a parity with the manufactured products, does not cause the farmer to increase the production.

Beyond that, anyone familiar with the geography of our country and who knows the possibilities of climate and soil would never make the statement that this country is capable of producing very much more wheat than it has produced in 1915. If one would travel west of the Allegheny Mountains and go out to the Pacific country, through the great Prairie States and the Rocky Mountain States, he would observe that all the areas that can be made productive of wheat have been made productive, and those areas that are left suitable for cultivation only by means of irrigation are never utilized in the production of wheat but for crops that have a shorter duration in their growth and development and maturity. So I say to my good friend from Connecticut, let him travel more around the country and study more thoughtfully the purposes of the bill.

Mr. McLEAN. I think if the Senator would go to Pennsylvania and New York and ascertain the number of bushels of wheat that could be raised in those States, if it had to be done, he would find that they could feed the whole American people. But never mind that—

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I will gladly yield to the Senator in a moment. I was inspired to follow up this inquiry by a statement made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], I think it was, on yesterday that he was opposed to the pending bill but was in favor of the bill offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. The Senator from Idaho is not in the Chamber at the moment, and I do not like to make a statement in his absence.

Mr. McNARY. I shall be very glad to send for him.

Mr. McLEAN. I think he said if the two bills could be coupled together he might favor them both. There is a possibility that all the different and learned authors of these projects—I have several in my office—may, before we get through, put their heads together and endeavor to enact them all. I think then the appropriation would be something above \$500,000,000. I am wondering whether the Senators who are so anxious to have taxes reduced will be able to vote for any reduction whatever if we meet these demands. But, Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the pending bill any longer at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President—

Mr. McLEAN. Just a moment, and then I shall finish and yield the floor to the Senator.

I have said, and I repeat, that I should be glad to do anything that would result in a permanent benefit to the interests involved, but if I know anything about the history of this sort of legislation, where it has been tried over and over and over again, it will defeat its own purposes, and the very men who are the most anxious to try the experiment will lament its result.

It is inevitable if we follow the principles upon which the industrial and economic liberties of American citizenship have been based from the foundation of this Republic. Whenever Congress undertakes to interfere with the law of supply and demand it makes a mistake which, if not fatal, will be sincerely regretted by the very men who advocate it.

So far as I am concerned if I should vote for the bill my conscience would tell me that I voted for it solely for the purpose of increasing the production of food that would sustain and stimulate the life of that most blessed of all animals, the dear old Republican elephant, and for no other purpose. But I am afraid that even in this hope I would fail because I fancy Senators on the other side of the Chamber who vote for the bill would take the platform and insist that the increased production in the particular kind of food which I have described was suitable only for that historic and patient animal, not as handsome as the elephant, but one which is at the present time much more in need of political sustenance.

Mr. BURSUM obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURSUM. I rose for the purpose of propounding a question to the Senator from Connecticut. I desire to ask the Senator from Connecticut if he thinks that farm production, especially wheat growers, is an essential element necessary to the economic life of this country?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not think the Senator really feels that it is necessary for me to answer that question in the affirmative. I take it for granted that bread is the staff of life, and we must have it.

Mr. BURSUM. Then we ought to continue the farmer, and how can the farmer continue at a loss? The Senator well understands that the farmer, unlike many other elements of industry, is not in a position to obtain the benefits of a competitive basis for the sale of his products; that is, upon the basis on which similar products may be imported from European countries. The net result, so far as the farmer is concerned, is that his surplus going to foreign markets fixes the prices of his commodity here at home, while the market in which he must purchase is realizing the benefits from the competitive basis upon which the commodity may be brought in from foreign countries. Therefore one of two things must happen: Either the value of the commodities which the farmer must of necessity purchase must be reduced down to the level of his purchasing power or his commodity must be brought up to the level of the purchasing power of the things which he must purchase in order to operate his business.

The trouble with the farmer, and I think it is well recognized, is that he has no agency through which he can successfully control the marketing and distribution of his products, while the other industries, who do get the benefit of the tariff and of the competitive basis of similar products being imported from foreign countries, are in a position to finance themselves, to control overproduction and to control the sale and distribution. In other words, the purchasing power of the farmer is much less than that of the other elements of industry. It goes without saying that the farmer, without any capital, can not continue indefinitely losing money. So there has arisen an emergency and some form of relief is necessary which will afford the farmer an agency by which he may sell his products on the basis of the American standard and not on the foreign standard; some method whereby the surplus may be taken care of and separated from the supply which is intended for American consumption. If the Senator from Connecticut knows of

any other remedy which will bring about such a situation, well and good; but it seems to me that something is necessary in order to equalize conditions.

Mr. McLEAN. That is the very point I have been discussing. If the Government undertakes in this instance to stabilize the price of wheat, I do not know why it should not undertake to stabilize the price of all products where there may be a surplus. The farmers produce a surplus in this country. If they did not they would have the full advantage of the tariff.

Mr. BURSUM rose.

Mr. McLEAN. Pardon me. If they can reduce their production below the surplus margin, they will get the benefit of the tariff.

Mr. BURSUM. That is not necessarily essential.

Mr. McLEAN. I know, but that would be the result. There is only one way by which the farmers can control prices—organize and control production.

Mr. BURSUM. For instance, if sewing machines are manufactured in greater quantities than are required in this country, the surplus is sold abroad, sometimes for less than the price for which sewing machines are sold in this country. That is necessary in order to protect the industry. The proposition is, if we are to maintain our industries on the American standard, that standard must extend to all elements of industry; otherwise there will be great hardship and suffering and liquidation among certain elements of our industrial life. In some way all those elements must be entitled to the benefit of the same standard.

Mr. McLEAN. It is the same with the wheat grower as with the potato grower. As I have instanced here, nearly two years ago the potato growers lost millions; they did not receive much more than half the cost of production. The Senator would single out one industry, one product, and have the Government come to its aid alone. As soon as we shall do that we shall hear not only from Montana but we shall hear from Maine. There also may be an overproduction of oranges in Florida and California, and we shall hear from those States. So it will go, until finally we shall have the Government engaged in a proceeding which will not only exhaust the Treasury but which will result in a colossal surplus which the Government can not handle.

Mr. BURSUM. It ought not to exhaust the Treasury or take a dollar out of it. The cost of marketing the surplus should be absorbed in the cost of that portion of the production which is sold here at home, and which represents 90 per cent of the total.

Mr. McLEAN. That depends upon the amount of the surplus. When the Government guarantees a profit the surplus of wheat will be mountain high.

Mr. BURSUM. There is no guaranty of profits, as I understand.

Mr. McLEAN. It is proposed that the Government stabilize the price of wheat because the farmers will not continue to raise it unless they can raise it at a profit.

Mr. BURSUM. The proposition is simply to guarantee a market on a competitive basis, and not to guarantee a profit. I have heard nothing of guaranteeing a profit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President, I should like to put the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] on record. I should like to ask him if he would be in favor of the farmers of the United States organizing and ascertaining the cost of production and asking a price for their products which would cover that?

Mr. McLEAN. I think we have already amended the law for the benefit of the farmer in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I want the Senator to answer my question.

Mr. McLEAN. I voted for that law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. The Senator voted for what?

Mr. McLEAN. I voted to take the farmer out from the operation of the Sherman Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. That answer is not satisfactory to me. I understand the Senator from Connecticut represents a State where there are many great manufacturing industries. The people of his State set the price. The manufacturer, the wholesaler, the retailer—they all set the price; but the farmer does not do that. Is the Senator from Connecticut, then, in favor of organization so that farmers may ascertain the cost of production, for the farmer is the biggest manufacturer of all the manufacturers?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Just a moment. The farmer manufactures tobacco, wool, hogs, sheep, and everything, does he not? Yes; and yet he lets somebody else set the price for him. That is all there is to it.

Now, the manufacturer has got his hand in the pocket of the wholesaler; the wholesaler has got his hand in the pocket of the retailer; the retailer has got his hand in the pocket of Mr. Farmer; but where is the pocket into which Mr. Farmer can put his hand? There is none.

I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he is willing for the farmer to go to the manufacturer and say, "Here, I want to get the cost of production?"

Mr. McLEAN. We try to ascertain the cost of production when we fix the tariff rates; but sometimes we succeed and sometimes we do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. How did the Republicans fix the tariff rate in the last Congress?

Mr. McLEAN. We fixed a tariff of 30 cents a bushel on wheat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. That is not enough, but that was all right in one way. But look where the farmer buys. While he sells abroad in a wholesale market, he buys in a retail market, which is protected by the people of the manufacturing States. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McLEAN. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I wish to have an answer to that question.

Mr. McLEAN. I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that if the farmers of Minnesota want to organize and control the market for wheat, go to it; there is no legal obstacle; I shall not interfere with them, because I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I, too, am a farmer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I am willing—

Mr. McLEAN. Just a moment. I should like to find some way in which I can operate a farm at a sure profit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Well, has the Senator from Connecticut any suggestion to make? Has he introduced any bills to the effect he has suggested?

Mr. McLEAN. I have been trying to explain to the Senator from Minnesota why I have not introduced any bills for that purpose. It is because I do not believe that Congress, by law, can control natural disadvantages, or wisely interfere with the law of supply and demand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. No; but I wish to ask another question. I am willing to throw away all of the pending bills if the Senate and the House of Representatives will get behind a proposition to help organize the farmers so that they can ascertain the cost of production and ask a reasonable and fair profit to enable them to keep their families as men in the cities keep their families, because in the city the prices are set. They always fix the prices in the city, do they not? Why, certainly.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not live in the city, in the first place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I do not care; the Senator is a lawyer; he is an attorney, and he sets his prices.

Mr. McLEAN. I have not practiced law for a great many years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Then the Senator does something else and sets the price for his services; there is no question about that.

Mr. McLEAN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Everybody else sets the price except the farmer. He produces, but lets somebody else set the price.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator let the farmer go to it and set his own price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. We would like to do it, not to starve out anybody else. But that is why when they sent me down here they said, "Maybe you can help us out; you can not make things any worse for us than the Republicans have." [Laughter.]

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I don't know about that. The Senator from Minnesota has my sympathy. I was brought up on a farm and operated one; it is the only business I have when I am not here. The farmers now can organize—there is nothing to interfere with them in that regard—just as any other producers can organize, only the farmers are not restricted by legislation as other industries are restricted. In that respect he has every preference.

I do not like to take the time of the Senate to repeat the real cause for the situation in which the farmer finds himself, but he has a case either of overproduction or underconsumption, and he has a very high wage scale; he has to pay a high price for his machinery; and circumstances are such at present that it is very difficult for him to produce anything that he can sell at a profit. He has my full sympathy. I would be very glad to help him in any legitimate way, but my point is that if the Congress undertakes to use the Treasury of the

United States to assure him a profit he will immediately have a surplus which will crush him and the Treasury.

I yield the floor, Mr. President. I shall be glad to hear from the Senators from the Northwest.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Connecticut misunderstood my statement yesterday when I said that this bill, so far as I could see, was intended to benefit farmers who are not able to make loans under present conditions by enabling them to go into the raising of livestock or livestock products, not for the particular reason of providing food products for the farm in the way of meat and milk, and so forth, but to give them something that they could sell, such as milk and eggs and beef and poultry and things of that kind that would help pay their store bills and in that way keep down overhead expenses and put them on a somewhat more successful basis.

The Senator from Connecticut has referred a number of times to the law of supply and demand. He spoke about the free operation of the law of supply and demand, and was afraid that this bill or some other measure which Congress might enact would interfere with the natural law of supply and demand. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut when has the natural law of supply and demand freely operated for the benefit of the farmer; that is, in fixing the price of the products of the farmer?

Mr. McLEAN. I take it it is operating not only freely but too freely at the present time, and that is the reason why wheat can not be raised in the Northwest at a profit.

Mr. FRAZIER. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. McLEAN. Canada produced a surplus of 300,000,000 bushels of wheat last year and we produced a surplus of about 150,000,000 bushels.

Mr. FRAZIER. And untold millions were starving in Europe.

Mr. McLEAN. That may be, but they had not any money with which to buy the wheat.

Mr. FRAZIER. But the demand is there just the same.

Mr. McLEAN. When Russia resumes raising wheat, I will inform the Senator, there will be little opportunity for the wheat growers of the Northwest to sell Dakota wheat in Europe unless they sell it for 50 cents a bushel.

Mr. FRAZIER. I want to say that there is not a surplus in this country of the kind of wheat we raise in North Dakota, and there never will be. We raise a kind of wheat that has got to be mixed with the kind of wheat produced in Connecticut in order to make a good grade of flour. It is No. 1 hard northern wheat, and there is no surplus of it in this country, and none of it is ever shipped abroad. We have to import it from Canada to get enough to mix with other wheat in order to obtain good flour for our own people.

Mr. McLEAN. Then, you get the benefit of the tariff to a certain extent?

Mr. FRAZIER. We would if it were protected, as it ought to be protected.

Mr. McLEAN. Do you not, as a matter of fact, get some benefit from the tariff?

Mr. FRAZIER. But very little under the present situation. I do not want to go into that question at the present time, because it is not part of the discussion of this bill, but the Senator from Connecticut made such rash statements along certain lines that I felt some correction should be made.

It would seem from the Senator's statements that he objects to the farmers selling their wheat or any other products at a profit.

Mr. McLEAN. Oh, no.

Mr. FRAZIER. He asked the Senator from Oregon if his bill was not designed to allow the farmer to sell his grain at a profit.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes; if the money for the profit is furnished out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FRAZIER. It does not make any difference whether it comes out of the Treasury of the United States or not, the fact is that if the farmer is going to live he has got to get a profit for the commodities which he produces. The Senator will admit that the farmer produces those commodities which he and the people of Connecticut and the people of the rest of the United States have got to have in order to live, and the farmer must, if he is going to continue in business, put the farm on a paying basis, which it has not been on in the past.

The Senator also stated that there was no reason why the farmer should not organize. Perhaps there is not, and yet past experience of the farmers is that every organization that has ever been attempted for the benefit of the farmers themselves has been bucked and opposed by a concerted effort on

the part of the financial interests of this Nation which have been thoroughly organized for many years.

You can take the bankers' associations, chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, and all of the rest of them right down the line, and the law of supply and demand does not fix the price of farm products—not by any possible stretch of the greatest imagination. It is the grain gamblers of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the Board of Trade of Chicago and the rest of the places like that that fix the price of wheat; and the same thing is true of the rest of our products, beef products and the rest.

We pay 15 cents a quart for milk right here in the city of Washington to-day. Is it the law of supply and demand that makes that price? No; it is not, and the farmer out here is not getting any 15 cents a quart for his milk. The reason why we pay 15 cents a quart for milk is because of the organized sellers who sell that milk.

The reason why we are paying 9 cents a pound for bread to-day here in the city of Washington is not the law of supply and demand, and it is not based on the price of wheat that the farmer gets. It is because there is an organization of the bakers, who are organized so that they can control the price of bread.

Mr. McLEAN. They ought to be prosecuted.

Mr. FRAZIER. They should be prosecuted, yes; perhaps that is right, but they are not. What the farmer can not understand is why Congress and why men like the Senator from Connecticut here oppose any measure, apparently, for the benefit of the farmer, while—I do not know what the Senator's record is—but in the past bills have been passed by Congress to benefit other lines of business—the manufacturers, the bankers, the railroads, the coal operators, and the rest of the big interests. Then why can not the farmers have just a little bit of protection, just a little bit of consideration, at the hands of these same gentlemen who have protected big business interests in this Nation in the past?

The little bill that is up before us now is only a drop in the bucket. It makes but very little difference one way or the other in my estimation. It will help some farmers to get on their feet; but a bill like the McNary-Haugen bill or the Norris-Sinclair bill will be a real relief to the farmers. I was glad to hear the Senator from Connecticut say that he would support any measure that would honestly help the farmers. I shall take pleasure in calling that statement to his attention if he takes the same attitude when these other bills come up that he has taken here to-day.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] might have suggested to the Senator from Connecticut that the people have lost, in the lease of the oil reserves, many millions of dollars, in fact hundreds of millions of dollars, and there is a disposition on the part of some to defend the leases which occasioned these losses which amount to hundreds of millions, and I want to say here and now that before many weeks have elapsed I expect to see Senators on the other side openly defending the oil leases, and seeking to bolster up the cause of those who have taken over this vast property of the Government of the United States.

While I am on that subject I want to read a telegram, in order that the committee on investigation may have some suggestions on the subject to-day, because they probably will examine some one or two phases of this question on to-morrow.

When the Senate was discussing the necessity for the resignation of Mr. Denby, and suggestions were being made that Mr. Daugherty should resign, a telegram was sent from Washington to Mr. Ed McLean, at Palm Beach, Fla. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 29, 1924—1.20 p. m.

Saw principal. Delivered message. He says greatly appreciates, and sends regards to you and Mrs. McLean. There will be no rocking of boat and no resignations. He expects reaction from unwarranted political attacks.

(Signed) BENNETT.

That is Mr. Bennett, of the Washington Post. I think the "principal" referred to here is the President. I think the statement that there would be no resignations is in keeping with the statement the Times had, in an article by Mr. Clark, stating that the President had said that he would not permit Mr. Denby to resign.

I think these two things are intimately related and refer to the same subject matter, that they mean just what this telegram sets out, that the "principal"—or the President—has been seen, and that he thinks favorable reaction in a political way will follow; that there will be no rocking of the boat if the President can prevent it, and no resignations forthcoming because of the terrible disclosures just made.

I quoted the President here as having said that he would not permit Mr. Denby to resign, and that was after this telegram was sent and Mr. Denby was boldly declaring that he would not resign. I should like to have the committee ask Mr. Bennett to-morrow morning—I understand that he is going to appear before the committee—to explain this telegram in detail, and explain exactly what he meant when he said that he had seen the "principal." It may be that he will state that he never saw the principal or the President in person; and I should like to have the committee ask him who did see him, and who brought to him the statement that he had been seen. In other words, I want to suggest, a day in advance, that the committee go very thoroughly and minutely into the details regarding this particular telegram. I make that request.

Mr. President, the bill pending here is a sad disclosure of the awful conditions that we find under a Republican administration. Here are the people in several States hard pressed, and some poverty stricken, when Republican periodicals, for political purposes, are boasting that we have prosperity throughout the country. Here are the people of four or five sovereign States in the Northwest begging the Congress to do something to permit thousands of farmers and their families to have a chance to live, and yet we have had a Republican administration in control of every branch of the Government for three years and a little more.

While there is prosperity in the East, the section that is sapping the substance of the other three sections of the country, we are here debating for two days a measure that seeks to bring relief to a great army of farmers in the great Northwest, mortgaged, debt ridden, and poverty stricken; everything that the farmer has, personal property of every kind, farm lands and all, covered with mortgages, and he says he has reached his row's end, bankrupted and broke; and this is the fruit of a Republican administration!

I want to remind the Senators on the other side who seem to have forgotten that when the Republican deflation panic was on you contributed to the undoing of agriculture, you would not permit the farmer to obtain loans on the very cattle that you caused him to lose and that you are now seeking to buy back for him and take a mortgage on for the Government. You would not permit him to have the same rediscount rates that the gamblers of Wall Street got during that period. Not only that, but you charged him a high progressive interest rate, ranging from 10 to 30 per cent and higher, when your gamblers in New York were obtaining money at from 5 to 6 and 6½ per cent. You had one standard of financial accommodations for the East and quite another and harder standard for the people of the South and West, and finally you became so cold and cruel that you would not permit the people of the South to borrow money on cotton at all. Our farmers were helpless and could not obtain a dollar on cotton. We could not obtain a dollar on Liberty bonds finally for the agricultural section of the South; neither could they obtain such loans in the West. They could not get loans upon their cattle; they could not get loans on their lands. You had a high interest rate for the South and West, a progressive interest rate. The more money the farmer needed by reason of the organized efforts to rob him the higher you placed the rediscount rate. You finally reached the point where you would not let him have a dollar. Now everyone can clearly see that you have sown the wind and you are reaping the whirlwind, and "as ye sow, so shall ye reap." You mistreated the farmer; you withdrew from him the aid of governmental instrumentalities established for his benefit; you permitted those who wanted to pillage and plunder him to do so. Now you have him in a despondent and impoverished state and you are calling on the Government to loan him some money to temporarily get him out of the mire into which you have thrown him, and all this just before a presidential election.

Mr. President, I have in my desk here a cartoon. It is the most appropriate and timely thing that I have seen. It is a picture of the G. O. P. elephant. Some friend was kind enough to send it to me. It has this big, old G. O. P. elephant on the side of a lagoon, and President "Cautious Cal" Coolidge is sitting upon his head, and the farmer is down in the mud and mire and slush of the lagoon, and the old elephant has come up to the edge of it and is reaching his trunk—or snout, as the boys call it down home—taking the farmer by the arm to pull him out just before the presidential election, to get him on his feet and feed him up and fatten him so that they can get his vote, and the predatory interests can slaughter him again after election if the Republicans should win in the national election. That is what goes on under Republican rule. Will certain people never learn the wisdom and necessity for abandoning for good

the boss-ridden and time-serving Republican Party of to-day? Can the people be fooled again by the leaders of the old stand-pat party as we know them here to-day?

Mr. President, these farmers were not always in this dreadful condition. Under a Democratic administration prosperity reigned in the West. We had taken the control of the money supply and credits out of the hands of Wall Street. The farmer in the West was prosperous. He was getting a good price for his products. He had money in his pocket and money in the bank; but when these mighty money lords of New York told these new Republican leaders, "We are going to contribute funds to help put you in power, and when we do you will have to turn over to us the money instrumentalities of the country, the control of the money supply and credits; we have got to have our feast if we furnish the money to put you in," and, Mr. President, we have seen the contract fulfilled to the hurt and injury of millions of American people, and now the Teapot Dome scandal looms up to blacken and cap the climax of it all. They not only robbed the South and West, but they robbed that which was intrusted to their care, the Government itself; and fortunate it is that all this is being brought to the attention of the people, whose Government this is, prior to another presidential election.

I have never seen—and I have been in Congress for some time—the instrumentalities of the Government used in a single instance in a way to benefit the common masses of the common people when the Republican Party was in power—not once.

I have in mind now an instance where the instrumentalities of Government are used to hurt the farmers of my section, the cotton farmers of the South. They tell us, Mr. President, that when you make a big cotton crop that we must expect a low price, because we have too much cotton; the law of supply and demand they tell us regulates that, and when you have a greater supply than is needed, the price is bound to come down. Then we say, "If that is true, when we have a small crop, a supply too small to meet the consumptive demand, then the law of supply and demand would, if permitted to operate, compel a higher price for cotton, and we would be entitled to get a high price to offset the low price we received when the crop is said to be too large." But not so.

What do we find to-day regarding the attitude of the Government toward raw cotton in the United States? We have a cotton crop that is three and a half to four million bales short of the world's consumptive demand. We find the governmental instrumentalities padding the Washington report, adding cotton bales to make up cotton that has not been produced and is not in existence.

There are from 579,000 to 610,000 bales reported in this bogus Census Bureau Government report that can not be found anywhere in the United States. We find the Bureau of the Census, in Mr. Hoover's department, adding cotton bales—hundreds of thousands of them—to the hurt and injury of the cotton producer, simply to balance with distribution. We said, "How is that? Here is the ginners' report covering gins scattered through the 820 counties of the Cotton Belt. They tell exactly how many bales have been ginned. That is the supply that is coming into sight in the United States. Cotton imported is accounted for by Government agents at the port of entry. We can tell how much has come in from the outside and from these two sources we know what the supply is."

"Well," they say, I suppose, "but we add what some of the New England spinners said they had left over and on hand."

But we said, "They have not got it. They are mistaken. The ginners' report shows so many million bales. They imported so many thousand bales; we added them together, and that gives us the correct total, but the figures that you give us show that you have added without rhyme or reason about 610,000 more bales than the figures justify." We said, "How do you get this balance?" They said, "We guessed at or just added these hundreds of thousands of bales to make our report on the cotton supply balance with distribution."

We said, "Why, you have not given the cotton farmer credit for what the ginners' report shows he actually made, but you have added to what he actually made out of your imagination to help the spinners and speculators bear the market about 610,000 bales."

It is a corrupt and scandalous performance. I know of no other way to characterize it. We had one of the agents up here, a Mr. Zimmerman—and I am going to remember him, too, as soon as the Democrats get into power.

We said, "Where do you get this 50,000?"
"I added that for cotton ginned in Texas."

"Have you the ginners' report? We see here where you have 100,000, when only 50,000 had been ginned in Texas."

"That is right," he said, "I added that." He had counted the 50,000 bales twice. So he had the producer charged with 100,000 bales in that one instance when he admitted that there were only 50,000 bales that should have been in the report.

We said, "The other; how did you get that?"

He said, "We estimated it."

"Estimated it—why?"

"To balance with distribution." I raised this point when we had him before the conference of Senators from the cotton-growing States. I said, "Here you have on hand at the cotton mills in the South 531,000 bales, and in the northern mills 687,000 bales, when the fact is the southern mills consume twice as much cotton as they do in the northern mills, and you have somehow got about 150,000 bales more in the northern mills than you have in the southern mills." He was embarrassed; he could not explain that.

Mr. President, I am mentioning this to show that the Republican Party in power never uses its imagination or indulges in guesses to favor the average man, the plain citizen, in the common walks of life. It is always found showing favors to some big concern, and when they do guesswork and put up a smooth job, it is always on that side.

How long will it take for the old-time, self-respecting Republicans of other days to wake up and know the present-day Republican Party as it is and repudiate it as the subservient tool of the predatory interests of the Nation?

Mr. President, I believe that is all I have to say this afternoon. I will probably have some more remarks to make on this bill to-morrow, after I have had the opportunity of examining certain hearings on the bill.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Chief Executive has issued an important statement, an address to members of the Philippine Commission now visiting Washington in connection with the independence of the people of the Philippine Islands. The statement discusses relationship between the people of the United States and of the Philippines, and the President expresses the opinion that the time has not yet arrived when independence should be granted.

The evidence set forth in the statement upon which this opinion is based is that the natives of the islands have been unable to appreciate the ability and services of the present Governor General. The President says plainly that is one reason upon which he justifies his conclusion that the present relationship between the Government of the United States and the Philippines should be continued. The statement also incorporates the following:

If the time comes when it is apparent that independence would be better for the people of the Philippines, from the point of view of both their domestic concerns and their status in the world, and if, when that time comes the Filipino people desire complete independence, it is not possible to doubt that the American Government and people will gladly accord it.

The statement admits, apparently, that the best interests of the United States justify granting independence to the Filipinos. The policy of continuing the exercise of authority of this Government over the islands is justified by the President solely upon the ground that the Philippine people require protection against themselves and supervision against a probably improvident government if independence be granted them.

Mr. President, the sentiment among the people of the Philippines appears to be almost unanimous in favor of independence. It is undoubtedly true that great advancement has been made since the American occupation of the islands began in 1898. This advancement is evidenced by improved sanitary conditions, better facilities for education, and the existence of a highway system which is constantly being extended and improved. But, sir, the hearings before the Senate committee which has been considering this subject show that resolutions have been unanimously adopted by the Philippine Assembly urging that this Government now permit the citizens of the islands to take over and control their own affairs, and that these resolutions have been supported not only by the members of the assembly who have been elected by the people of the Philippines but also with equal enthusiasm by those members of the assembly who have been appointed by the Governor General, which indicates that so powerful is the sentiment in favor of independence that even the influence of the Governor General has not been sufficient to prevent his own appointees from supporting and advocating that policy.

It is clear to everyone who has studied the subject that the recognition of Philippine independence would relieve the United States Government of a very grave responsibility. It has been

said, Mr. President, that the treaties negotiated by the Washington conference last year have so adjusted international problems in the Orient that there is not the slightest probability of our possessions in the East being questioned or disturbed by any foreign power. Yet it is unquestionably true that by our agreement in the naval arms-limitation treaties, in which the United States promised not to further fortify our possessions in the Pacific, we have left those possessions at the mercy of any power which might choose to attack them.

This would seem to be a peculiarly opportune time for granting independence to the people of the Philippines. While they have expressed appreciation for the splendid services our Government has rendered them in the past, there is in the breasts of the enlightened natives a desire for liberty. They believe that independence ought to be granted them. They are well-nigh unanimous in insisting that the pledge made by the United States Government in the act of 1916 to accord them full liberty should be redeemed, and that this should be done now or in the early future.

The difficulties in the way of granting independence will increase in number and grow stronger with the passing of time. The hearings show that American business interests and American influences are gathering volume day by day.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. While the Senator is speaking of the difficulties, I was wondering whether he had pursued the subject far enough to cause him to desire to make a statement about the financial side of the question. As the Senator knows, he being a member of the committee and one of the most useful members of it, here are about \$70,000,000 of bonds issued by the Philippine government, for the maintenance of the value of which the credit of the Government of the United States is pledged. What is the Senator's thought as to how that matter should be cared for in the event we grant them independence?

Mr. ROBINSON. I was just about to say that not only is American influence in the Philippines growing stronger, and that therefore the difficulty of granting independence will increase with the passing of time, but American financial ties and obligations are expected to increase rather than diminish in the future, so that it would be easier now to solve the financial problems which appear to be inseparably connected with the question of independence than it probably again will be during the lifetime of the present generation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I will yield in just a moment. The outstanding bonds are probably less in amount now than they will be again during the present generation so long as the United States Government retains supervision over the Philippines, so that the problem in that particular is easier now than it will ever be again. Now the representatives of the Philippine Government have themselves suggested that no objection will be interposed to pledging a portion of the revenues of the islands as security for the redemption of the payment of those bonds. Whether that is the most practicable and feasible plan that could be devised I am not prepared to say, but certainly the problem is easier now than it will be hereafter, easier now than it will be 25 years in the future.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I take it for granted that the Senator is not desiring the Senate to proceed to any immediate consideration of the Philippine question, and I only say that I was about to make an inquiry similar to that which the Senator from Ohio has done. Since the Senator has asked the question, I wish to say that there are further obligations than the bonds referred to, and conditions that I presume have been looked up or will be before the subject comes regularly before the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] indicated that he felt that our Government had pledged itself to the payment of the \$70,000,000 referred to.

Mr. WILLIS. It is a moral responsibility, at least.

Mr. KING. There is absolutely no guaranty and no pledge. The city of Manila has borrowed something like \$4,000,000, and the Philippine government has borrowed a considerable amount, largely, if not entirely, in the United States, but there is absolutely no guaranty by the United States for the payment of a single dollar of the Philippine debt. The Senator will remember that in the hearings the only reference to that question was that perhaps there was a moral obligation merely because the United States was exercising sovereignty over the

islands, and the Governor of the Philippine Islands had been named by the President of the United States.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will permit me very briefly, I recall very well the statement made as suggested by the Senator from Utah. It is, of course, a moral obligation, yet it is well known that those bonds were sold with the tacit understanding, of course, that the Philippine Islands were a part of the United States. While there was no direct guaranty by the Government of the United States, the bonds were sold with the understanding that the Government of the United States was back of them.

Mr. ROBINSON. No; Mr. President, I am not willing to recognize that principle. The language of a written obligation, a public bond, is such that one can not read into the obligation secret or private understandings with governments or individuals who are not parties to the contract, assuming responsibility for their payment. Such a suggestion is to me unreasonable. Whatever may be the responsibility of the United States for those bonds, the United States must and will assume to discharge. I would not attempt to say that the Philippine bonds are a moral obligation of our Government, but if they are the United States must and will discharge that moral obligation.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. The reason why I suggest that at this time is because the Senator very accurately and properly referred to the fact that it was proposed that the revenue should be pledged to the payment of the bonds. Now, if our Government has no obligation, of course, we ought not to have anything in the world to do with the revenues of the Philippine Islands, and there is no reason why they should be pledged to us for any purpose.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BAYARD. May I state to the Senator from Ohio that at the hearing the other day, I think he was a little bit late. Secretary of War Weeks was there and this same question came up. He stated at that time that doubtless if the United States Government gave the Filipinos their freedom, in the course of a few years the bonds would go down in value, but so far as his opinion was concerned the United States had no obligation of any kind to assume responsibility of payment, that if engagements were made with the Filipinos that if their freedom was given to them they should underwrite some portion of their governmental income to liquidate the bonds, that would be merely because the Filipinos felt that the floating of the bonds at par in the first place was a moral obligation which the Filipinos had undertaken and not the United States.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to ask a question of the Senator. I do not desire to trespass unduly on the time of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Delaware that there is, then, no moral obligation at all on the part of the Government of the United States touching the bonds?

Mr. BAYARD. I am of the opinion very frankly that the Government has not a moral obligation under the circumstances.

Mr. WILLIS. I disagree with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wonder why the Senator from Ohio thinks there is any moral obligation upon the part of the United States. When the Philippine Islands were annexed President McKinley issued a proclamation declaring that there was no purpose whatever upon the part of the United States permanently to annex the Philippine Islands; that it was intended merely to hold them until the people of the islands should familiarize themselves with the principles of self-government and exhibit a capacity for governing themselves. That declaration has been repeatedly asseverated by our public men since and took the form of a formal enactment of the Congress in the year 1916, as stated by the Senator from Arkansas.

Any man who bought the Philippine bonds bought them with the full realization that some time or other the Philippines would have their independence unless we were to repudiate the solemn proclamation of President McKinley at the time the islands were acquired.

That proclamation, I might say, was at that time promulgated in order to still apprehension entertained by some foreign governments concerning aggressive purposes upon the part of this Government of ours. Those bonds, therefore, were taken with the complete information upon the part of the purchasers that at some time or other the Philippines were to be given their independence.

Of course, in modern times a government never discharges its obligations. It merely refunds them; that is, sometimes it reduces them. We hope in time to reduce our great obligations, but the great bulk of our national debt will be refunded. It will not be paid off. So if there is anything to the argument at all that we ought to postpone the redemption of our promise to give the Philippines their independence until the bonds of the Philippine Islands are discharged, we might just as well say that we repudiate our obligations.

I would like to inquire of the Senator whether he thinks the moral obligation of the United States to sustain the bonds is greater than the moral obligation of the United States to redeem its promise made at the time the Philippines were acquired?

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a brief statement.

Mr. WILLIS. It will be very brief. The Senator from Montana misapprehends entirely my purpose. I am not now canvassing the question at all as to whether independence should now be granted. I simply spoke of the financial side of the question. While I agree with the historic facts that he has recited, it being understood that it was the purpose of this Government ab initio eventually to make the Philippine Islands free, I can not overcome the feeling that the obligations that are incurred meanwhile before they become independent are to some extent resting upon us—not a legal obligation, of course I recognize that, but I think they become a moral obligation. But I am not citing that at all as an argument to postpone the granting of independence. If that can be done, it would rest upon other considerations than what I have stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have already said that when a contract, correctly denominated as a bond, is executed there are written into its provisions all the obligations which can be asserted in connection with it. It is unheard of to say that there is a moral obligation on the part of the United States to pay the bonds of another government or another people when the United States did not issue and did not sign the bonds and did not assume any liability in connection with them. But, I repeat, whatever may be the obligation of the United States, if it has any obligation to discharge in connection with the bonds of the Philippines, that obligation is lighter now and more easily discharged now than it will ever be again during the present generation. The hearings show that instead of diminishing in amount, the bonds are likely to increase in amount and all the while the ties that bind us to the Philippines and that tend to keep us in the exercise of authority over them are growing stronger and more numerous, and it will be easier now than it will ever be again to redeem the pledge made when we uplifted above the islands the flag of this Republic that we would give them independence as soon as conditions justify it.

But, sir, reverting to the topic discussed by the Senator from Ohio, there is a suggestion that independence should not be granted until some financial arrangement is made satisfactory to the holders of bonds issued by the Philippine people so that the United States would in effect guarantee the obligations of the Philippines now in existence against a decline on the market. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Ohio to place financial obligations above the pledge made by this Government to grant liberty to a people over whom we have exercised authority? Considerations of liberty, the right of people to govern themselves, are the very highest known to civilized people. These considerations must not be subordinated to mercenary interests and they will not be.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD the statement of the President, recently issued, which prompted the remarks which I have made upon the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission will be granted.

The President's letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, February 21, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. ROXAS: The resolutions adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines, touching upon the relations between the Filipino people and the Government of the United

States, have been received. I have noted carefully all that you have said regarding the history of these relations. I have sought to inform myself so thoroughly as might be as to the occasions of current irritation between the legislature of the Philippines and the executive authority of the islands.

In your presentment you have set forth more or less definitely a series of grievances, the gravamen of which is that the present executive authority of the islands, designated by the United States Government, is in your opinion out of sympathy with the reasonable national aspirations of the Filipino people. If I do not misinterpret your protest, you are disposed to doubt whether your people may reasonably expect, if the present executive policy shall continue, that the Government of the United States will in reasonable time justify the hopes which your people entertain of ultimate independence.

The declaration of the commission of independence charges the Governor General with illegal, arbitrary, and undemocratic policies, in consequence of which the leaders of Filipino participation in the government have resigned and their resignations have been accepted by the Governor General.

The commission of independence declares that it is necessary "to take all needful steps and to make use of all lawful means within our power to obtain the complete vindication of the liberties of the country now violated and invaded." It proceeds: "And we declare, finally, that this event, grave and serious as it is, once more demonstrates that the immediate and absolute independence of the Philippines, which the whole country demands, is the only complete and satisfactory settlement of the Philippine problem."

It is occasion for satisfaction to all concerned that this declaration is couched in terms of moderation, and that it goes no further than to invoke "all lawful means within our power." So long as such discussions as this shall be confined to the consideration of lawful means there will be reason to anticipate mutually beneficent conclusions. It is therefore a matter of congratulation, which I herewith extend, that you have chosen to carry on this discussion within the bounds of lawful claims and means. That you have thus declared the purpose to restrict your modes of appeal and methods of enforcing it is gratifying evidence of the progress which the Filipino people, under American auspices, have made toward a demonstrated capacity for self-government.

The extent to which the grievances which you suggest are shared by the Filipino people has been a subject of some disagreement. The American Government has information which justifies it in the confidence that a very large proportion, at any rate, and possibly a majority of the substantial citizenry of the islands does not support the claim that there are grounds for serious grievance. A considerable section of the Filipino people is further of the opinion that at this time any change which would weaken the tie between the Filipinos and the American Nation would be a misfortune to the islands. The world is in a state of high tension and unsettlement. The possibility of either economic or political disorders, calculated to bring misfortune, if not disaster, to the Filipino people, unless they are strongly supported, is not to be ignored. It should not be overlooked that within the past two years, as a result of international arrangements negotiated by the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament and Problems of the Far East, the position of the Filipino people has been greatly improved and assured. For the stabilizing advantages which accrue to them in virtue of the assurance of peace in the Pacific they are directly indebted to the initiative and efforts of the American Government.

They can ill afford in a time of so much uncertainty in the world to underrate the value of these contributions to their security. By reason of their assurance against attack by any power; by reason, also, of that financial and economic strength which inevitably accrues to them; by reason of the expanded and still expanding opportunities for industrial and economic development. Because of all these considerations, the Filipino people would do well to consider most carefully the value of their intimate association with the American Nation. Although they have made wonderful advances in the last quarter century, the Filipino people are by no means equipped, either in wealth or experience, to undertake the heavy burden which would be imposed upon them with political independence. Their position in the world is such that without American protection there would be the unrestricted temptation to maintain an extensive and costly diplomatic service, and an ineffective but costly military and naval service. It is to be doubted whether with the utmost exertion, the most complete solidarity among themselves, the most unqualified and devoted patriotism, it would be possible for the people of the islands to maintain an independent place in the world for an indefinite future.

In presenting these considerations, it is perhaps worth while to draw your attention to the conditions in which some other peoples find themselves by reason of lacking such guaranties and assurances as the Filipino people enjoy. The burdens of armament and of governmental expenses which many small nations are compelled to bear in these times, are so great that we see everywhere the evidence of

national prosperity and community progress hindered, if not destroyed, because of them. During the World War, the Filipino people were comparatively undisturbed in their ordinary pursuits, left free to continue their fine progress. But it may well be doubted whether, if they had been shorn of the protection afforded by the United States, they could have enjoyed so fortunate an experience. Much more probably they would have become involved in the great conflict and their independence and nationality would have become, as did those of many other peoples, pawns in the great world reorganization. There could be no more unfortunate posture in which to place a people such as your own. You have set your feet firmly in the path of advancement and improvement. But you need, above all else, assured opportunity of continuing in that course without interference from the outside or turmoil within. Working out the highest destiny of even the most talented and advanced of peoples is a matter of many generations.

A fair appraisal of all these considerations, and of others which suggest themselves without requiring enumeration, will, I am sure, justify the frank statement that the Government of the United States would not feel that it had performed its full duty by the Filipino people or discharged all of its obligations to civilization if it should yield at this time to your aspiration for national independence. The present relationship between the American Nation and the Filipino people arose out of a strange, an almost unparalleled, turn of international affairs. A great responsibility came unsought to the American people. It was not imposed upon them because they had yielded to any designs of imperialism or of colonial expansion. The fortunes of war brought American power to your islands, playing the part of an unexpected and a welcome deliverer. You may be very sure that the American people have never entertained purpose of exploiting the Filipino people or their country. There have, indeed, been different opinions among our own people as to the precisely proper relationship with the Filipinos. There are some among us, as there are some among your people, who believe that immediate independence of the Philippines would be best for both. I should be less than candid with you, however, if I did not say that, in my judgment, the strongest argument that has been used in the United States in support of immediate independence of the Philippines is not the argument that it would benefit the Filipinos but that it would advantage the United States. Feeling as I do, and as I am convinced the great majority of Americans do regarding our obligations to the Filipino people, I have to say that I regard such arguments as unworthy. The American people will not evade or repudiate the responsibility they have assumed in this matter. The American Government is convinced that it has the overwhelming support of the American Nation in its conviction that present independence would be a misfortune and might easily become a disaster to the Filipino people. Upon that conviction the policy of this Government is based.

Thus far I have suggested only some of the reasons related to international concerns, which seem to me to urge strongly against independence at this time. I wish now to review for a moment some domestic concerns of the Philippine Islands, which seem also to argue against present independence. The American Government has been most liberal in opening to the Filipino people the opportunities of the largest practicable participation in and control of their own administration. It has been a matter of pride and satisfaction to us, as I am sure it must also have been to your people, that this attitude has met with so fine a response. In education, in cultural advancement, in political conceptions, and institutional development, the Filipino people have demonstrated a capacity which can not but justify high hopes for their future. But it would be idle and insincere to suggest that they have yet proved their possession of the completely developed political capacity which is necessary to a minor nation assuming the full responsibility of maintaining itself in the family of nations. I am frankly convinced that the very mission upon which you have addressed me is itself an evidence that something is yet lacking in development of political consciousness and capability.

One who examines the grounds on which are based the protests against the present situation is forced to conclude that there has not been, thus far, a full realization of the fundamental ideals of democratic-republican government. There have been evidences of a certain inability, or unwillingness, to recognize that this type of governmental organization rests upon the theory of complete separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial functions. There have been many evidences of disposition to extend the functions of the legislature, and thereby to curtail the proper authority of the executive. It has been charged that the present Governor General has in some matters exceeded his proper authority; but an examination of the facts seems rather to support the charge that the legislative branch of the insular government has been the real offender through seeking to extend its own authority into some areas of what should properly be the executive realm.

The Government of the United States has full confidence in the ability, good intentions, fairness, and sincerity of the present Governor General. It is convinced that he has intended to act and has acted

within the scope of his proper and constitutional authority. Thus convinced, it is determined to sustain him; and its purpose will be to encourage the broadest and most intelligent cooperation of the Filipino people in this policy. Looking at the whole situation fairly and impartially, one can not but feel that if the Filipino people can not cooperate in the support and encouragement of as good an administration as has been afforded under Governor General Wood, their failure will be rather a testimony of unpreparedness for the full obligations of citizenship than an evidence of patriotic eagerness to advance their country. I am convinced that Governor General Wood has at no time been other than a hard-working, painstaking, and conscientious administrator. I have found no evidence that he had exceeded his proper authority, or that he has acted with any other than the purpose of best serving the real interest of the Filipino people. Thus believing, I feel that I am serving those same interests by saying frankly that it is not possible to consider the extension of a larger measure of autonomy to the Filipino people until they shall have demonstrated a readiness and capacity to cooperate fully and effectively with the American Government and authorities. For such cooperation I earnestly appeal to every friend of the islands and their people. I feel all confidence that, in the measure in which it shall be extended, the American Government will be disposed to grant in increasing degree the aspirations of your people. Nothing could more regrettably affect the relations of the two peoples than that the Filipinos should commit themselves to a program calculated to inspire the fear that possibly the governmental concessions already made have been in any measure premature.

In conclusion let me say that I have given careful and somewhat extended consideration to the representations you have laid before me. I have sought counsel of a large number of men whom I believed able to give the best advice. Particularly I have had in mind always that the American Nation could not entertain the purpose of holding any other people in a position of vassalage. In accepting the obligations which came to them with the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands the American people had only the wish to serve, advance, and improve the condition of the Filipino people. That thought has been uppermost in every American determination concerning the islands. You may be sure that it will continue the dominating factor in the American consideration of the many problems which must inevitably grow out of such relationship as exists.

In any survey of the history of the islands in the last quarter century I think the conclusion inescapable that the Filipino people, not the people of the United States, have been the gainers. It is not possible to believe that the American people would wish otherwise to continue their responsibility in regard to the sovereignty and administration of the islands. It is not conceivable that they would desire, merely because they possessed the power, to continue exercising any measure of authority over a people who could better govern themselves on a basis of complete independence. If the time comes when it is apparent that independence would be better for the people of the Philippines from the point of view of both their domestic concerns and their status in the world, and if when that time comes the Filipino people desire complete independence, it is not possible to doubt that the American Government and people will gladly accord it.

Frankly, it is not felt that that time has come. It is felt that in the present state of world relationship the American Government owes an obligation to continue extending a protecting arm to the people of these islands. It is felt also that, quite aside from this consideration, there remain to be achieved by the Filipino people many greater advances on the road of education, culture, economic and political capacity before they should undertake the full responsibility for their administration. The American Government will assuredly cooperate in every way to encourage and inspire the full measure of progress which still seems a necessary preliminary to independence.

Yours very truly,

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

HON. MANUEL ROXAS,

Chairman the Philippine Mission,

2034 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

NATIONS OR TRIBES OF INDIANS IN MONTANA, IDAHO, AND WASHINGTON.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, on the 3d day of March the Senate passed the bill (S. 321) for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana, Idaho, and Washington. To-day there came to us from the House of Representatives House bill 3444, identical with the bill to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is asked by the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Montana what is the nature of the bill?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is a bill proposing to authorize certain nations or tribes of Indians to begin suit in the Court of Claims against the United States to establish claims which they assert they have against the Government.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3444) for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana, Idaho, and Washington, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to consider and determine all legal and equitable claims against the United States of the Blackfeet, Blood, Piegan, and Gros Ventre Nations or Tribes of Indians, residing upon the Blackfeet and Fort Belknap Indian Reservations, in the State of Montana; and the Flathead, Kootenais, and Upper Pend d'Oreilles Nations or Tribes of Indians, residing upon the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana; and the Nez Perce Nation or Tribe of Indians, residing upon the Lapwai Indian Reservation, in the State of Idaho, and upon the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, for lands or hunting rights claimed to be existing in all said nations or tribes of Indians by virtue of the treaty of October 17, 1855 (11 Stat. L., p. 657, and the following), and in said Flathead, Kootenais, and Upper Pend d'Oreilles Nations or Tribes of Indians by virtue of the treaty of July 16, 1855 (12 Stat. L., p. 975, and the following), with said Indians, and all claims arising directly therefrom which lands and hunting rights are alleged to have been taken from the said Indians by the United States, and also any legal or equitable defenses, set-offs, or counterclaims, including gratuities, which the United States may have against the said nations or tribes, and to enter judgment thereon, all claims and defenses to be considered without regard to lapse of time; and the final judgment and satisfaction thereof shall be in full settlement of all said claims.

That suits under this act shall be begun by the filing of a petition within two years of the date of the approval of this act, to be verified by the attorney or attorneys selected by the claimant Indians, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, employed under contracts executed and approved in accordance with existing law. The claimant Indians shall be parties plaintiff and the United States shall be the party defendant, and such suits shall on motion of either party be advanced on the docket of the Court of Claims and of the Supreme Court of the United States. The compensation to be paid the attorneys for the claimant Indians shall be determined by the Court of Claims in accordance with terms of the said approved contracts and shall be paid out of any sum or sums found and adjudged to be due said Indians: But in no event shall said compensation exceed 10 per cent of the amount of the respective judgments, nor exceed \$25,000 for the Indians residing on each respective reservation: *Provided, however,* That said compensation shall not exceed \$25,000 for the Nez Perce Nation or Tribe of Indians residing upon both the Lapwai and Colville Indian Reservations, nor exceed 10 per cent of the amount of any judgments rendered in favor of said Nez Perce Nation or Tribe, said compensation to be exclusive of all actual and necessary expenses in prosecuting said suits. The balance of any such judgments shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians entitled thereto and draw interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIVE-CENT STREET CAR FARES.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a few days ago an article appeared in the New York Times under the following headlines:

Five-cent trolleys to stay in Jersey. Company says higher traffic under lower fare is reducing deficit. Light rates will be cut. Request of State commission for lower gas and electricity is granted.

The article reads:

New Jersey will keep its present 5-cent trolley fare indefinitely and, if it wishes, can have gas and electric rates reduced an estimated 5 per cent.

Thomas N. McCarter, president of the Public Service Corporation, made this announcement at a conference with the State Public Utilities Commission at Newark yesterday. Formal decision by the latter was reserved pending presentation of detailed schedules. The commission had requested a reduction.

About 147 municipalities, from Camden to the northern boundary of the State, will be benefited by the retention of the 5-cent street car fare, which has been on trial since the settlement of the New Jersey trolley strike last September. The fare previously had been 8 cents.

President McCarter indicated that the Public Service Railway Co., operator of the trolley system, had not only found a 5-cent return profitable thus far, but that after a long run of deficits this revenue might even enable the corporation to "turn the corner."

I shall not read the remainder of the article, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the article is as follows:

The trolleys have reached their lowest point in deficits in the belief of his corporation, Mr. McCarter told the State commissioners. He said that the expected increase in traffic justified belief that the company would "rapidly reduce the loss sustained in operation of its cars under the 5-cent rate." Repeating that this tariff would be continued for an indefinite period, he expressed hope that "continued cooperation of the people of New Jersey" would finally eliminate all loss in operation.

JITNEY OWNERS WORRIED.

The "expected increase in traffic" was taken by some of the jitney owners in the larger New Jersey travel centers last night as meaning further steps against them by the trolley corporation. These operators have already instituted a "recall" movement against Thomas L. Raymond, Newark director of streets and public improvements, alleging that he has discriminated against them in favor of the street railway company.

The jitney men also complained that they could no longer safely sell a jitney, for the trolley company, they asserted, was picking up vehicles on the more lucrative routes through agents. They renewed a standing charge that the company sought to gain a monopoly on busses on competing routes in order to put them out of business. This was denied by the company spokesmen.

The cut in gas and electric rates would bring a corresponding cut in gas receipts of \$1,000,000, and in electric receipts of \$1,500,000. Mr. McCarter told the State commission. He was unable as yet to announce what the exact rates would be. Such a reduction has been asked in a letter sent to the Public Service Corporation last week by Harry V. Osborne, chairman of the State board. The State urged that the cut was warranted by the good business done in 1923. Profit on electricity last year was 10 per cent, the board asserted, and on gas 12 per cent. The profit allowed by law is 8 per cent.

AFFECTS MOST THE POPULATION.

President McCarter and his associates concurred yesterday in the view held by the State officials, although holding that in accordance with present-day property values the existing rates of \$1.25 a thousand feet for gas and 9 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity were justified. Nevertheless, they had decided to meet the requests, they said.

The Public Service Electric Co. serves 202 New Jersey municipalities, with a population of 2,500,000, and the Public Service Gas Co. pipes gas into homes in 168 municipalities having a population of 2,300,000. It was estimated that the companies served about five-sixths of the population of the entire State.

The Public Service Corporation was represented at the conference by President McCarter, Vice President Edmund W. Wakelee, Vice President Percy Young, and General Solicitor Harry S. Blake. Commissioners Osborne, Autenrieth, and Gnichtel represented the State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the article that it is very pertinent in connection with the present hearings on the 5-cent street car fare bill for the city of Washington. In the New Jersey cases, where all the New Jersey companies returned to a 5-cent fare, after a trial of some six months, I am told the trolley companies believe that it will permit them to make more money, and they say from their experience that the return to the 5-cent fare for the past six months shows that they will make more money, as the article which I have read well illustrates.

I merely wish to say in addition in that connection that if a return from an 8-cent fare, which has been tried all over New Jersey, to a 5-cent fare will enable those companies that have had trouble in making ordinary expenses, without declaring a dividend, to make money, surely the people of Washington ought not to be inflicted with an 8-cent car fare, when the companies here are making money. It was testified just a day or two ago that in 1919, the year in which the car fares in this city were raised by the Public Utilities Commission from 5 cents to 8 cents, that one street railway corporation paid a 6 per cent dividend and made over \$1,000,000 besides, which was credited to other accounts. It not only made a 6 per cent return upon capital, but made over \$1,000,000 in excess; and yet the people of Washington are being inflicted by the street car companies here with an 8-cent fare.

AGRICULTURAL DIVERSIFICATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to promote a permanent system of self-supporting agriculture in regions adversely affected by the stimulation of wheat production during the war, and aggravated by many years of small yields and high production costs of wheat.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, I wish to renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the pending bill, being Senate bill 2250, and all amendments on Friday, March 7, at 3 o'clock. I hope that such an unanimous-consent agreement may be entered into.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I had understood that we might have a vote on the bill to-morrow.

Mr. LADD. I am perfectly willing that to-morrow be fixed, but I was told that it would be impossible, and so I changed it to Friday. Of course, I should be glad to have the vote taken to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senate is anxious that some final action be taken regarding the bill. I make no objection to the request.

Mr. LADD. In conformity with the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas, I will change the day to Thursday at 3 o'clock.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator had better adhere to his first request and make it Friday. In that event there will be no objection so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not desire to object, but I hope the Senator will not fix the time for a vote on Friday because I am compelled to be absent for a time on that day and I wish to vote for the Senator's bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator that while I think I shall vote for his bill, I will not consent to any unanimous-consent agreement to fix a definite time for a vote on the bill and all amendments at a particular hour. I often have seen it happen under an agreement of that kind that when the time came to vote and there were a good many amendments pending, some of them of very great importance, we had to vote on them without any consideration. So I gave notice some time ago that I would not give my consent to any such agreement as that in the future. I did so on that ground. Now, if the Senator will ask that debate be closed on the bill at a certain time and that after that time debate on amendments shall be limited to 5 minutes or 10 minutes—I do not care which—and that no Senator shall speak more than once on an amendment and more than once on the bill, I shall make no objection.

Mr. LADD. I will accept that suggestion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota for unanimous consent?

Mr. COUZENS. Let the request be read.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I suggest there be a general limitation, that debate on the bill shall close at a certain time, and that thereafter Senators shall be permitted to speak only upon amendments to be offered, not to exceed 10 minutes on any one amendment. I think such provision ought always be put in a unanimous-consent agreement to bring the discussion of a measure to a close. My observation in the Senate has been, and my experience as well, that if we limit debate to six hours, for instance, and then provide that a vote shall be taken without further debate a few Senators occupy all the time, and the Senators who wish to present their views in a short speech occupying 10 or 20 minutes never have an opportunity to express themselves on the measure at all; but the speeches that consume hours occupy all the time. I hope the agreement will be modified to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 3 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of March 7, 1924, the Senate will proceed to vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (S. 2250) to promote a permanent system of self-supporting agriculture in regions adversely affected by the stimulation of wheat production during the war, and aggravated by many years of small yields and high production costs of wheat through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 3 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or more than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right, Mr. President, except that the first part of the proposed agreement requires a vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest that the proposed agreement be modified so as to cover the bill and leave out reference to amendments. Then the proviso as to the limitation of debate will take care of the debate on the amendments.

Mr. KING. The proposed agreement should provide that all general debate shall cease at 3 o'clock on that day, and thereafter all debate shall be limited to debate upon amendments, and no Senator shall speak oftener than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Inasmuch as debate is going to be allowed to proceed both upon the bill and upon amendments after 3 o'clock, I do not see any necessity of saying anything except that after 3 o'clock on Friday no speech either on the bill or any amendment shall be longer than 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. And that no Senator shall speak more than once on any amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That will accomplish the purpose and bring a vote within an hour or two, I am quite certain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota accept the suggestion?

Mr. LADD. I accept the suggestion.

Mr. WILLIS. Let the agreement be read.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me suggest that I do not think under the rule a roll call is required in a case of this kind, because this agreement does not fix a definite time to vote on the bill.

Mr. LODGE. No; it does not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So a roll call is not necessary in order to enter into this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall not object, Mr. President; but, if it could be arranged, I should like to have it so planned that the limitation on debate leading to a vote could be fixed for some day other than Friday. Could it be on Thursday? Is there any objection to striking out "Friday" and inserting "Thursday"? I can not be here on Friday, and I should like to be present when a vote is taken on the bill.

Mr. KING. Some Senators can not be here on Thursday, and others can not be here on Saturday.

Mr. WILLIS. How about Monday? Everyone can be here on Monday.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator from North Dakota would like to have the bill disposed of before that time. I have no objection to any time that suits the Senator after and including Friday.

Mr. WILLIS. I am not going to object, but I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will accept the suggestion for Monday instead of Friday?

Mr. LADD. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the vote being taken on Monday, if it will accommodate Senators better to devote the time between now and then to other subjects.

Mr. CURTIS. If we could go ahead with the appropriation bill in the meantime, that would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. LADD. I have no objection to laying this bill aside temporarily and having other matters taken up from time to time until Monday.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us make it Monday, then.

Mr. LADD. I will ask, then, that the day be changed to "Monday."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota agrees that "Friday" shall be stricken from the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and that "Monday" shall be inserted in lieu thereof. Is there objection to the agreement as thus modified? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRISON. Let the unanimous-consent agreement be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after 3 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, March 10, general debate on the bill shall cease, and thereafter debate shall be limited to 10 minutes on the bill and each amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Ten minutes by each Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Each Senator is limited to one speech.

Mr. LODGE. Each Senator shall speak once and not longer than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from North Dakota now lays aside his bill temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the unanimous-consent agreement been entered into?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. COUZENS. No; it has not.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; the Chair announced that there was no objection to it.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand that it has not yet been reduced to writing.

Mr. CURTIS. Let it be read, so that we can agree to it.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that after 3 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, March 10, general debate on the bill shall cease, being Senate bill 2250, and thereafter no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, that is not as I understood the request. I did not understand that debate was to cease at 3 o'clock, because, as the Senator from Washington said, that is perfectly inconsistent with the privilege of speaking 10 minutes more on the bill after 3 o'clock. I thought we had agreed to the proposition that it was sufficient if we said that beginning at 3 o'clock no Senator shall speak more than 10 minutes either on the bill or on any amendment pending or to be offered.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is all that is necessary, and that effectuates the purpose of the Senator in offering the agreement. There is no such thing as general debate in the Senate under the rules of the Senate, and there is nothing else under the practice of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Chair waiting for the agreement to be read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled that unanimous consent was given, but there was some confusion about the terms of the agreement. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up House bill 6349, the appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. R. 6349.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, has the agreement been entered into by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, let the agreement be read from the desk.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the situation of the bill of the Senator from North Dakota? It was before the Senate a minute ago.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6349, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think that would displace the unfinished business. If it is temporarily laid aside, however, that is all right.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood that the Senator from North Dakota asked unanimous consent to lay aside the bill temporarily. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, Mr. President, so that we may know just what was done, may we not have the unanimous-consent agreement read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after the hour of 3 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, March 10, 1924, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes upon the bill (S. 2250) to promote a permanent system of self-supporting agriculture, etc., or upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask a question about the agreement, because the same point came up in connection with other unanimous-consent agreements. Under the agreement can a Senator talk 10 minutes upon an amendment and then 10 minutes upon the bill, or does it mean that a Senator has only 10 minutes upon the bill and all amendments that may be offered?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senate decided that the last time the question came up. The Chair ruled that a Senator had a right to speak 20 minutes—10 minutes on an amendment and 10 minutes on the bill—and the Senate overruled him.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but let us change the language so as to cover what we want. That is what I wanted to be sure of.

The READING CLERK. Striking out the word "or" and inserting the word "and" would make it read "10 minutes upon the bill and 10 minutes upon any amendment offered to S. 2250."

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right. That makes it perfectly plain.

Mr. KING. Let it go that way.

The agreement as entered into is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after the hour of 3 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, March 10, 1924, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes upon the bill (S. 2250) to promote a permanent system of self-supporting agriculture in regions adversely affected by the stimulation of wheat production during the war, and aggravated by many years of small yields and high production costs of wheat, and upon any amendment offered thereto.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6349) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator desire to proceed with the bill this evening?

Mr. WARREN. I expect to lay it aside, because it is desired to have an executive session.

Mr. KING. And resume its consideration to-morrow?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that an executive session is desired. I therefore ask to have the bill laid aside. I give notice that in the morning I shall ask the Senate to take it up immediately after the close of the routine morning business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 6, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of March 3), 1924.

TO BE UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE.

Joseph C. Grew, of New Hampshire, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland, to be Undersecretary of State.

SPECIAL COUNSEL.

Samuel Knight, of San Francisco, Calif., as special counsel to prosecute proceedings and assert and establish the title of the United States to sections 16 and 36, township 30 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, within the exterior limits of naval reserve No. 1, in the State of California, and any suit or suits ancillary thereto or necessary or desirable to arrest the exhaustion of the oil within said sections 16 and 36, pending such proceedings, as provided in Senate Resolution No. 71, approved April 21, 1924.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

James B. Brown, a citizen of Missouri, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 9th day of February, 1924.

Arthur D. Hawkins, a citizen of Minnesota, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 9th day of February, 1924.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Clara L. Drummond to be postmaster at Lamison, Ala., in place of C. L. Drummond. Office became third class January 1, 1924.

CALIFORNIA.

Harold K. Rankin to be postmaster at Ocean Beach, Calif., in place of H. K. Rankin. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

CONNECTICUT.

Herbert E. Erwin to be postmaster at New Britain, Conn., in place of W. F. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

FLORIDA.

Guy K. Masten to be postmaster at Vero, Fla., in place of O. H. Linn. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1924.

William J. Carter to be postmaster at Homestead, Fla., in place of W. J. Carter. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1924.

ILLINOIS.

Pearl E. Smith to be postmaster at Colp, Ill., in place of I. A. Guffey. Office became third class October 1, 1923.

Robert N. Bragg to be postmaster at Brimfield, Ill., in place of George Howard, resigned.

James W. Scott to be postmaster at Monmouth, Ill., in place of J. W. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1924.

Arthur F. Sturgis to be postmaster at Middletown, Ill., in place of A. F. Sturgis. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1924.

Edward F. Tedens to be postmaster at Lemont, Ill., in place of E. F. Tedens. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1924.

Rose S. Beard to be postmaster at Arenzville, Ill., in place of R. S. Beard. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1924.

INDIANA.

John T. Stevenson to be postmaster at Kirklint, Ind., in place of S. A. Thompson, removed.

Menno Burkhalter to be postmaster at Berne, Ind., in place of Vilas Schindler. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

KENTUCKY.

William C. Huddleston to be postmaster at Butler, Ky., in place of E. F. Yelton. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1923.

MAINE.

Harry J. White to be postmaster at Jonesport, Me., in place of H. J. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Raymond H. Gould to be postmaster at Millers Falls, Mass., in place of R. H. Gould. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1924.

MICHIGAN.

Arthur R. Gerow to be postmaster at Cheboygan, Mich., in place of John Noll. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1923.

MINNESOTA.

Gay C. Huntley to be postmaster at Hill City, Minn., in place of G. C. Huntley. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1924.

MISSOURI.

John B. Wilson to be postmaster at Maysville, Mo., in place of C. C. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

NEBRASKA.

Edwin P. Clements jr., to be postmaster at Ord, Nebr., in place of W. A. Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1923.

NEW JERSEY.

Byron M. Prugh to be postmaster at Westfield, N. J., in place of R. L. DeCamps, resigned.

NEW YORK.

Clayton J. Bannister to be postmaster at Westfield, N. Y., in place of E. N. Skinner, resigned.

Harry C. Holcomb to be postmaster at Porterville, N. Y., in place of John Cronin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

Leon Pralatowski to be postmaster at Cold Springs, N. Y., in place of Leon Pralatowski. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1924.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Thomas S. Keeter to be postmaster at Grover, N. C., in place of T. S. Keeter. Incumbent's commission expired January 1, 1924.
Joseph G. Gamble to be postmaster at Davidson, N. C., in place of M. W. Cranford. Incumbent's commission expired August 8, 1923.

OHIO.

Frank A. Brown to be postmaster at Batavia, Ohio, in place of S. O. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1924.

OKLAHOMA.

Bernice Pitman to be postmaster at Waukomis, Okla., in place of C. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Marion C. Hemmig to be postmaster at Elverson, Pa., in place of M. C. Hemmig. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

Ida E. Megargel to be postmaster at Canadensis, Pa., in place of I. S. Price. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1924.

RHODE ISLAND.

Joseph E. Noel to be postmaster at Arctic, R. I., in place of Leon Charbonneau, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

Everett M. Greer to be postmaster at Newport, Tenn., in place of J. M. Jones, resigned.

TEXAS.

Nora C. Brite to be postmaster at Pleasanton, Tex., in place of S. C. Hankinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1924.

Ira S. Koon to be postmaster at Hallsville, Tex., in place of I. S. Koon. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1924.

Chesell Gra to be postmaster at Brookshire, Tex., in place of J. D. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1924.

VERMONT.

Sanford A. Daniels to be postmaster at Brattleboro, Vt., in place of M. J. Moran, deceased.

Robert A. Slater to be postmaster at South Royalton, Vt., in place of H. A. Sherlock. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1923.

WASHINGTON.

Mabel G. Lamm to be postmaster at Burlington, Wash., in place of M. G. Lamm. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1924.

WISCONSIN.

Simon F. Wehrwein to be postmaster at Manitowoc, Wis., in place of H. C. Schuette, resigned.

Frank W. Stanley to be postmaster at Omro, Wis., in place of F. J. Maher. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of March 3), 1924.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Ira K. Wells to be Assistant Attorney General.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Edward C. Ernst to be surgeon.

Peter J. Gorman to be surgeon.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Edward Fuller Witsell to be major, Chemical Warfare Service.

Paul Xavier English to be major, Chemical Warfare Service.

Howard Winthrop Turner to be captain, Field Artillery.

Robert Chapin Candee to be captain, Air Service.

John Sharpe Griffith to be second lieutenant, Air Service.

Brainerd Taylor to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Edwin Albert Zundel to be major, Field Artillery.

Morgan Ellis Jones to be captain, Infantry.

Fannin Adkin Morgan to be captain, Judge Advocate General's Department.

George Howard Rarey to be captain, Infantry.

Jacob Edward Uhrig to be captain, Infantry.

Joseph William Kullman to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

George Dewey Rogers to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Robert Jones Merrick to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

William Henry John Dunham to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Irvin Alexander to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Eugene Manuel Landrum to be captain, Adjutant General's Department.

James Byron Haskell to be major, Signal Corps.

James Perrine Barney to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

John Davis, Arriba.

Harold J. Schwarzel, Carbondale.

Thomas B. Scott, Meeker.

MAINE.

Carl W. Mitchell, Union.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Arthur M. Rolfe, Salem Depot.

OHIO.

Howard E. Foster, Chagrin Falls.

Frank L. Lee, East Youngstown.

Frank H. Shaw, Germantown.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Nathaniel Shaplin, Windgap.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 5, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In our minds and hearts, O Lord, be Thou exalted above the heavens and the earth. Continue to speak to us in wisdom, truth, and holiness. Thou alone art able to satisfy the longing soul and lead the step aright. Teach us the way of Thy statutes and give us understanding that we may keep Thy law. Holy, holy, holy is Thy name. Let Thy light go out through all the world and Thy words to the ends of the earth. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE CHARGE OF THE LIGHT BEER BRIGADE.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it was a very interesting occurrence yesterday when 58 bills to bring back beer and wine were introduced by 58 gentlemen of the House. There were the "57 varieties" in addition to my friend the gentleman from Maryland, Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL. There were 57 generals and my friend HILL as generalissimo.

I simply want to suggest certain facts to be faced by this highly generalized beer bloc. They ought to face the facts as to what Charles Edward Russell has said of conditions in England under the widespread use of beer; what A. B. MacDonald, special writer of the Ladies' Home Journal, has said about the use of beer and wine in Quebec; and what the attitude of labor is as demonstrated in the referendum on beer and wine in Michigan several years ago when, after a year of state-wide prohibition, only two cities in the whole State gave any majority for beer and wine.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman support a referendum to the people of the United States on the question of beer and wine?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will not support a referendum to declare unconstitutional a part of the Constitution.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is begging the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to call attention to the further fact that out of the 435 Members of the House, with the appeal that was made, there were only 58 who have been willing to sponsor this proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Unless I can get more time I can not yield. I will ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and then I will yield to questions.